THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS IN NEW ZEALAND 1840-1920

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree
of
Master of Arts in History
in the
University of Canterbury
by
K.R. Adams

University of Canterbury
1986

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the growth and development of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in New Zealand, from 1840-1920. It is concerned with looking at the way a small handful of individuals in 1840 grew into a fully fledged church in 1920. Also to be examined is the role, if any, the English society played in this development, through the visits of ministering Friends. It is divided into five chapters each following a set period of time in which these questions are examined.

INTRODUCTION

"All churches change with the passage of time, but few have changed as visibly and dramatically as the Society of Friends."[1] This comment, taken from Elizabeth Isichei's book on English Quakers, is equally applicable to New Zealand Friends in the period under study. In the 80 years from 1840 to 1920 Friends in New Zealand would undergo a great transformation, from humble beginnings in 1840, to a well established denomination in 1920. For one to have predicited in 1840 that Friends would progress to the position they attained by 1920 would have seemed foolish. Only 26 Friends were recorded in New Zealand in 1853: this makes the developments that took place even more significant. During the period under study (1840-1920), the number of Friends rose to approximately 430. Compared to other churches in New Zealand Friends numbers will never be large, but to compare Friends with other churches is a mistake. Strength in numbers and in organization is often an indicator of progress but for Friends this is not always the case.

Quakerism credits its foundation to one George Fox[2] who as a young man went through several mystical experiences, which left him with the central insight that knowledge of God and holiness come from direct communion with His spirit. After seeking spiritual comfort among several religious groups of the time, he describes one of his most profound experiences in this way.

> When all my hopes in them [professional clergy] and in all men were gone so that I had nothing outwardly to help me, nor could tell me what to do, then, Oh then, I heard a voice which said 'There is one, even Christ Jesus, that can speak to thy condition' and when I heard it my heart did leap with joy. Then the Lord did let me see why there was none upon the earth that could speak to my condition...that Jesus might have pre-eminence, who enlightens and gives grace and faith, and power. Thus when God doth work who shall prevent it? And this I knew experimentally.[3]

At this time Quakerism had no membership or formal tenets. Fox gathered around him a band of seekers drawn from independent and like-minded groups, those who were dissatisfied with the way the Reformation had gone.

At the beginning of the period of this study there were 16,227 members in England accoording to an unofficial count by Friends themselves. The decline from a total of around 60,000 at the beginning of the eighteenth century was due to a number of factors, among them the extensive immigration of Friends and a readiness to expel delinquents, especially those who married non-members. Despite Fox's distrust of church organization they had developed a remarkably complex structure. At the head of this structure was the London Yearly Meeting. This was, and still is today, the parliament of Quakerism and it discussed the affairs of the movement as a whole. It was to this body through its various committees that Friends in New Zealand made submissions, asked for help, and there the affairs of New Zealand were debated. The Yearly Meeting through its committees was responsible for maintaining oversight and correspondence with Friends overseas. This included Monthly Meetings and those professing with the Society in the Australian Colonies and New Zealand.

Two committees of the Yearly Meeting were responsible for these activites, with a third replacing one of them in a later years. The first of these is the Meeting for Sufferings. It was originally set up to secure redress from the legal and social persecutions that Friends in Britain were undergoing, and it was agreed that 'certaine friends of this city be heare nominated to keep a constant meeting about sufferings'. As its original functions declined, fresh duties were thrust on upon it and it was defined by the London Yearly Meeting in 1833 as: "a standing committee of this Meeting...entrusted with a general care of whatever may arise during the intervals of this meeting affecting our religious society, and requiring immediate attention."[4] This committee was used by Friends throughout the period 1880-1910 for various matters arising in terms of finance. This especially applies to Auckland which during this time was building a Meeting house. Auckland's application for Monthly Meeting status was also sent through this meeting.

The second committee was the Continental Committee. Until 1906, when its duties were taken over by the newly constituted Australasian Committee, Friends in New Zealand looked to this the most. A separate committee of the Meeting for Sufferings was set up in 1817, and was responsible for maintaining oversight of Quaker groups overseas where there was no settled Yearly Meeting. (In fact it was not until 1964 that this particular status was granted to New Zealand) To this committee Friends sent letters describing their circumstances. The Meeting for Sufferings dealt with

applications such as that of Auckland but they were sent first to the Continental Committee. This was the arm of the Yearly Meeting that was most associated with New Zealand Friends.

In 1906, as previously mentioned, the Continental Committee handed over its responsibilities to the Australia Committee as it was known then. This new committee, renamed the Australasian Committee, oversaw most of the events that took place in New Zealand from 1906 onwards. Many of these decisions, such as the Annual Meetings' affairs and the applications of Wellington and Christchurch for Monthly Meeting status, were dealt with by this committee. It was to this committee that most of New Zealand Friends' pleas for visits from English Friends were sent. This and the other two committees gave detailed reports on the state of the New Zealand Society to the Yearly Meeting which in turn gave them advice. While New Zealand Friends reached a certain degree of autonomy by 1920 they could still not become completely independent, nor perhaps did they want to.

The next rung in the organizational structure was not to come into play in New Zealand till 1885 and1913. It was at this time that New Zealand gained its first Monthly and Quarterly Meetings. The Monthly Meeting was a Yearly Meeting in a microcosm, exercising many important executive functions. In co-operation with the overseers the members of the Monthly Meeting also acted as ecclesiastical policeman. These duties included whether to expel delinquents and whether to accept applicants for membership. On a local scale it registered births, deaths, and administered the

complex regulations governing Quaker Marriage. In New Zealand, until (at least), the advent of the Annual Meeting, the Monthly Meeting became much more important to Friends that its English counterpart would have been. Auckland while claiming jurisdiction only over its own area would more than likely have assumed authority for the whole of New Zealand. While it still relied on the Yearly Meeting for a great many things, and claimed no power other than that of a Monthly Meeting it would have still, in the eyes of some, seemed close to a Yearly Meeting.

In the English infrastructure the Quarterly Meeting was that immediately above the Monthly Meeting and consisted of a group of neighbouring Monthly Meetings. This met four times a year (as its name implies) but had few important functions, the main reason for its existence being to act as a channel of communication between the Monthly Meetings below it and the Yearly Meeting above.[5] While the Monthly Meeting fulfilled this function it was in reality much more than this to Friends. Like the Auckland Meeting when it was constituted, the Monthly Meeting came to be seen akin to a yearly Meeting. It became like the London Yearly Meeting, a parliament for Quakers in New Zealand. Although not to be constituted a Yearly Meeting until 1964 by 1920 it had taken on many of the functions of a Yearly Meeting. This included in 1914 approving the application of Christchurch Preparative Meeting for it to become a full Meeting for Discipline.

All of these concepts would have been familiar to the Friends who arrived in New Zealand. The main growth

factor among Friends right up until the end of the period was immigration from England and from a background that would not have prepared many of them for the life that they would embark upon in New Zealand. Many of them came from the middle-class and would have been educated at Quaker schools. They married Quakers and would have expected the same pattern of life for their children. It was the bait of free land which lured immigrants to Auckland,[6] but those who came to farm would have found the conditions especially hostile, with land often inaccessible and requiring much work. The transport in these areas remained primitive throughout this period and would have been a cause of despair to the immigrant Friends. They had been used to a system of roads, which, while not entirely of a suitable standard, were certainly vastly superior to those found in New Zealand. The rail system too was a sharp contrast to that which they had left behind. All in all a bleak picture met the immigrant Friend when arriving in New Zealand. Of course added to this was the fact that when they arrived there were no organized meetings of any sort, and for most the area in which they settled contained no other Friends besides themselves. With such a sharp contrast to that which they had left, the achievement of Friends in New Zealand is all the more remarkable.

Apart from the distinctive organizational structure, Quakerism is also marked by a distinctivness with regards to its beliefs and practices, the most notable of these being their form of worship. There is no 'hireling ministry' as with other denominations. From its very beginnings the Quaker

movement was made up of ordinary people who had no place among themselves for a 'salaried, academically trained clergymen'.[7] This meant that there was no preaching or reading from the Bible as in the services of other denominations, and meetings for worship were marked by silence punctuated with messages or concerns expressed by those who felt moved by what this 'corporate silence' had brought.[8] The essential belief which governed the meeting was that each member contained the 'light within'. This meant that all were potential ministers and thus in Quaker terminology if 'the spirit moved' then a person spoke, if not then the whole meeting was held in silence. As Quakers moved to America some meetings came to have ministers but this practice did not filter back to Britain. It was the preaching of this inner light of Christ 'which lighteth every man coming into the world' that drew many seekers who were burdened by a sense of 'inevitable damnation'.[9] This belief in the inner light was also to lead to convictions about the wrongness of war and the equality of women both of which will be discussed in more detail later.

The chapters of this thesis are ordered in periods of time, with the first three looking at periods of twenty years while the last two cover a period of a decade each. The reason for choosing such a method is that each period lends itself to a theme which illuminates a period of growth and development in the Society. The first chapter of the thesis is entitled 'The Individuals' and examines the role played by individuals who came to New Zealand at the beginning of the Wellington and Nelson colonies. Their interaction with the early

History of these colonies illuminates the principles they strove to keep despite their isolation in terms of numbers and from England. Their dogged determination to maintain their beliefs in spite of the many obstacles thrown in their way sets a pattern for the rest of the period. Thomas Mason in Wellington and the group who settled in Nelson provide one with an interesting picture of life in early New Zealand through a slightly different perspective. It is also during the first chapter that the first English Friends visit New Zealand, Frederick Mackie and Robert Lindsay. The visit of these two Friends is important, it is their visit and other subsequent ones, which are to be examined for their influence on the New Zealand Society.

The second chapter is still concerned with individuals but has a title which reflects the growing importance of groups in the New Zealand Society. 'A Step forward: From Individuals to Groups', deals with the attempt, especially during the 1870's, of the Society to begin Meetings for Worship in Auckland. Several unsuccessful attempts will be examined as well as the impact of the growing number of immigrant Friends in other places in New Zealand. The factors which governed the failure of these attempts will be looked at in some detail. At the end of the period a person who will play an important part in the Societies future arrived in New Zealand, Ann Fletcher Jackson.

Ann Jackson is the central character in the third chapter. It is through the influence of her and other Friends' that the Society begins, at last, to find its

footing and become more organized. In this chapter what these organizations were and how they were able to last longer than the previous attempts will be examined. Also as in the second chapter the growing number of Friends in other places and what they attempted to achieve in terms of organization will be examined. It is during this period also that the first concerted attempts by Friends were made to influence government policy with regards to the issue of militarism.

The fourth chapter looks at whether the problems which beset Friends between 1900 and 1911 were as bad as has been assumed. It is during this time that what is labeled in the chapter as the 'The English Perspective' comes into full blossom. This is made clear through the records kept of the visits of two Friends during this period, Edward and Edith Annett and Herbert and Mary Grace Corder. In this chapter the difference between what seems to have been a gloomy perspective, and the growth that actually took place is examined. It is during this period also that the attitude of Friends with regard to the issues of peace and compulsory militarism are brought further into the public eye anticipating the war.

The last chapter deals almost entirely with the war and Friends involvement in the issues surrounding it. From their protest against the 1909 and 1910 Defence Acts in 1911, to their pleas on behalf of those detained in prison as 'defiant resisters'. The chapter deals with Friends activities during this time. While intimately involved in protests against compulsory militarism, they also continued

to grow and develop the organization which is described in the previous chapter. Throughout these later chapters it will be seen that individuals are important. Friends' numbers throughout the period under study were consistently small,and while the thesis is concerned with the growth and development of the Society as a whole, it is important to see that particular individuals contributed much.

A note on the sources which were used in this thesis is needed. The Alexander Turnbull Library has two excellent collections of Friends material. One is a fifteen reel microfilm collection, which is a copy of that in the National Library of Australia while the other is a substantial manuscript collection which was given to the library in late 1985. Along with collections of papers of individual Friends make up the bulk of the primary source material. Further to this there are collections of Frederick Tuckett's papers in the Hocken Library in Dunedin and in Friends Meeting House in Auckland the Minute Books of the Auckland Monthly Meeting dating from its inception in 1885. If there does not seem to be a great deal of secondary material it is because not much has been written on Friends in general and in particular about New Zealand Friends, this is why there is a heavy reliance on Elizabeth Isichei's book. Finally, there is a substantial body of material in private hands that I was unable to research as on enquiry it was found that those who held it did not wish it to be used. One example of this is the twelve volume journal of Ann Fletcher Jackson's journeys around New Zealand.

ENDNOTES

1 Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p. xxiii

2 George Fox was born in July 1624 in Leictershire

3 George Fox, Journal In Quaker Spirituality: Selected Writings (ed.) by Douglas V. Steere p.7

4 London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1833 MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library

5 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.71

6 West M. & Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972 p.7

7 Quaker Spirituality p.13 8 Ibid. p.14

9 Lloyd A. Quaker Social History 1669-1738 p.18

CHAPTER ONE

THE INDIVIDUALS 1840-1860

In studying the history of a denomination, the individuals involved with its foundation are far more important to study, than the principles or the interaction of the denomination with the society as a whole. The simplest explanation of this is, the people are the denomination. Another and more important reason is that, through their interaction with the history of the period during which they founded the religion in the given country they give us some indication of how the religion would proceed from its foundation. In New Zealand the individuals who will be studied came to the colony at the time of the foundation of Nelson and Wellington. Therefore, they were not only the founders of Quakerism in New Zealand, but also played a part in the growth of these two New Zealand settlements. In some respects they were no different from many other individuals who emigrated to New Zealand in the same time period but unlike many of these others they reacted to the historical events in a distinctive way. The characteristic which caused this was that they were Quakers, a "peculiar people" as they thought of themselves.

The main reason for entitling this chapter 'The Individuals' is that according to an unofficial census in 1853 the total number of Friends was fourteen and there were 13

others connected in some way[1], and there was a small meeting in Nelson, but apart from this, there were only scattered Friends in various parts of New Zealand. Therefore in the twenty years that will be covered in this chapter these individuals are the Society. This is not to say that individuals later ceased to play a part in the Society, in fact the opposite is true. Two themes that run through this thesis reveal themselves in this chapter: the first is the geography of New Zealand and how it hindered the development of the Society; the second, the relationship between the English Society and the Society in New Zealand. The latter is examined with regard to the visit of two English Friends, whose census was mentioned above.

In describing Quakers in Victorian England and the influence they had on their contemporaries and the society at large, Elizabeth Isichei points out that despite their smallness: "the importance of the Quakers in Victorian England, and the impact they made on contemporaries, was quite disproportionate to their numbers."[2] The point which she is making is equally applicable to New Zealand in the period under discussion. This can be seen more clearly in Nelson, where for a period of about ten years there was a group of Quakers who were among the group of pioneer surveyors in the colony. The first thing of note is to examine with regard to Thomas Mason and the Nelson Friends is the part they played in the history of the regions they immigrated to.

The most notable of these were Frederick Tuckett and John Sylvaneus Cotterell, who both became involved in the Wairau

incident. The land involved in the eventual tragedy was discovered initially by Tuckett after he had travelled through the Tophouse Pass in search of more land. The surveying of the land was undertaken without consulting the chiefs involved namely Te Rauparaha, Rangihaeata and other chiefs of the Ngati Toa tribe.

> Antipathy against the white invaders had reached a dangerous stage when Captain Wakefield pushed forward the survey of valley. He did not know that this time resistance was to be more formidable than any previously encountered. Although a succession of Nagti Toa chiefs came to Nelson with clear and violent warnings, they were not at first taken seriously.[3]

These warnings went unheeded, leading directly to the Wairau Incident. It is not part of the outline of this thesis to give a detailed description of the incident but what is neccesary is a brief description of the background. Tuckett's involvement and the effect of his Quaker principles is important.

At first the Nelson settlement had seemed a success. Wakefield became more and more convinced of the pleased with the settlement of the site, estimating the available land at 313,840 acres.[4] However by September 1842 Wakefield was beginning to grow anxious. Instead of his earlier optimism he now found that he would be lucky to obtain 200,000 acres and after surveying Blind Bay he found he was still 165,000 acres short.[5] Tuckett's own journeys in the province before this had led him to the conclusion that 200,000 acres was not to be found anywhere in New Zealand let alone in Nelson.[6] So, by the end of 1842, Wakefield was desperate for land. The allotment

holders were very concerned that the Company was at that time unable to supply them with the land promised - 150 acres. In desperation he sent Cotterell and Tuckett to scout for land in the south-east. Towards the end of November Cotterell and his party discovered exactly what Wakefield had been looking for, an extensive parcel of good pasture land with easy access from the sea.[7]

This new area was for Wakefield the proverbial manna from heaven, especially as the land had been supposedly bought by his brother in 1839. Thus the Company proceeded to survey the land, against Maori opposition as was their pattern with most land titles.[8] The position about land ownership was much more complicated thatn the Company led others to believe. Claims on the purchase of this and other lands were awaiting an investigation by the Land Commissioner, Spain, before Crown titles could be issued. More complications arose from the fact that the Treaty of Waitangi and the Land Proclamation of 1840 had invalidated all land purchases before 1840 until they could be cleared by investigation. The treaty had given recognition of Maori property rights over all New Zealand. The Company had ridiculed both of these proclamations and had always had doubts whether the treaty could be treated as anything more than a 'praiseworthy device for amusing and pacifying savages for the moment'.[9] The Company further objected to having to prove that every land sale had been fully understood by every Maori who had a claim to it, and simply followed the age old adage of might is right. Those who follow this adage overreach themselves at some time and this

was to happen at Wairau.

Thus the surveyors should never have been in the Wairau. Under no circumstances could the New Zealand Company claim to have bought the area, but they were egged on by the demands of speculators in London to ignore the rights of Maori owners.[10] The Ngati Toa Chiefs who controlled the land, Te Rauparaha and Rangihaeta, had established, early in the nineteenth century, control over the whole of the area under survey. The incident itself and the events that led up to it are well documented elsewhere[11] and there is no need to repeat them here. In fact Tuckett's part in it was minimal mainly because he fled the scene before the skirmish was over.

Broad in his book on the Golden Jubilee of Nelson in 1892 described, Tuckett and his beliefs:

> He was a member of the Society of Friends, and wars and the rumours of wars, and the almost universal carrying of arms, filled him with disgust. He saw no near prospect of being able to complete the surveys - on the contrary, the obstacles appeared to be increasing and were in his opinion only likely to be removed by a demonstration of superior armed force.[12]

Tuckett's reaction to this, and the aftermath of the incident were handled in a way that testified to his Quaker integrity. He staunchly defended the Maori action at Wairau and for this was labelled, along with a few others as a "Mourite". This did not stop him as is shown by his letters to the Examiner in replying to the barrage of letters demanding action against the Maori. In one, he likened the Maori action to that taken by lords if they found poachers working the land and stated that their reaction would have been just as strong as that of

the Maori. Further he suggested that, while he hoped they were brought to justice, their lawyers were to plead any 'extenuating circumstances' they could in their defence.[13]

In his dealings with the New Zealand Company he was a man in many ways out of his time. This is never more clearly illustrated than in a paper he drew up before he left the colony in 1848. In it he savagely criticised the Company and its policies:

> The object of the writer, to show that those who have purchased land from the New Zealand Company, and others who have been induced to proceed to New Zealand or otherwise deceived and injured by them in their sevices as surveyors or contractors, are the parties entitled to repatriation and compensation, and that the Government should not aid a great wickedness and cruelty by the New Zealand Company is confessedly incompatible with the dignity of Government to induce persons of small capital to to buy land which they have not seen, or to induce such unaccustomed to manual labour to emigrate to New Zealand where they cannot compete with the emigrant labourers who have become coltiers, or with the natives in the cultivation of the land.[14]

The Wairau incident was not the end of Tuckett's involvement in the affairs of Nelson. With the death of Wakefield at Wairau, Tuckett was appointed the Resident Agent as well as Chief Surveyor. This involved him the problems associated with Nelson's labour force, which had begun before Wakefield's death and were compounded by it. At first the labourers had been employed in clearing roads and draining swamps, both were unpleasant and sometimes unhealthy jobs. Quite naturally the men who did these began to grumble at their low wages and finally went to Captain Wakefield with a petition.[15] Wakefield replied to this by pointing out that the labourers were free to leave at any time and that he was in

no position to grant any of their requests, as the limited resources of the Company simply could not cope with any raise.[16] After some heated discussions among themselves the workers finally drifted back to work. Tuckett took over at a time when things were still simmering and although a diligent officer he was no Captain Wakefield. His personality and directing energy meant that he was disliked by the labourers.[17] The task of combining the duties of Resident Agent and Chief Surveyor became too much for Tuckett so that Colonel Wakefield visited in August 1843 he begged him to be relieved of his post.

This did not happen and Tuckett continued in his dual role for another year. During this time he made it clear that he regarded the Company's scheme of employing men on public works which he regarded as a farce, and he proposed disciplinary action (so that he would have time to inspect all the operations) of paying the men fortnightly instead of weekly. This was not met with the approval by the labourers and they attacked his office with 'sticks, guns and threats'[18], which caused Tuckett to hastily revise his plans. One of these had been to offer land to the labourers in parcels of 2.5 to 5 acre lots. Alternatively those who were already on Company land would be advanced rations but refused employment. A second plan was to offer free passage to Australia to those who had been made redundant and further to deport those men who were the leaders of the unrest.[19] None of these plans was ever implemented, and after a series of incidents involving Tuckett and one of his assistants, Tuckett

finally handed the post to the new resident William Fox in September 1844. Tuckett left New Zealand, after completing the survey of Otago, in 1848.

In all these incidents we see Tucketts actions being determined by his principles as a Quaker. One of the main reasons he finally left Nelson was because even as a surveyor he was required to undertake his job underarmed, guard a situation which he felt must eventually involve resort to arms. It is this belief in their principles and the willingness to carry them out that laid the foundations for the Society of Friends in New Zealand.

Like Tuckett Samuel Stephens was a surveyor, but unlike Tuckett he stayed in New Zealand until his death in 1855 involving himself deeply in the affairs of the fledgling Nelson colony and the local political scene. His comments on governors, especially Grey, are pointers to this. He seems, again in contrast to Tuckett, to have been a strong supporter of the Company. His forthright opposition to the removal of the Nelson site to the Thames Valley by the Government and his support of the Company's insistence on Port Cooper[20] are examples of this. However his comments on the Governor's competency seem to have been in agreement with Tuckett: "The Governor throughout has shown the most bitter prejudice against the Company and the settlements are taking place under their auspices and is doing everything in his power to ruin the colony by imposing taxes and duties."[21]

Stephens' comments on this and on New Zealand society are made from the perspective of a Quaker but also from that of an

Englishman looking upon early New Zealand society, not particularly impressed by what he saw.

> Times and habits are indeed changed with the once barbarous New Zealander, he now on the contrary sets an example to what is called the civilised world by the exercise of many of those moral and Christian virtues, which many a white knows but by name, or knowing- never practises - Oh! how I blush for my countrymen, when I write that our fears for the safety of ourselves and property are not from the natives, but from the gangs of bad whitemen, who now infest the country.[22]

Stephens was concerned about the Maoris, whom he mentions several times, but this attitude changed after the Wairau incident. However, like Tuckett he believed that it was a minority who had been involved. Stephens also voiced Friends' principles on war in relation to the incident. When writing to his mother on the conduct of those who went to the Wairau, he stated agreement with her in being against war and felt that the world would be a better place without it.[23] In stating his distaste for war he qualified his stance by pointing out that the Society was unique in its thoughts on war.[24] Further he agreed with his mother that there would have been no fighting if the members of the expedition had not been armed but he defended the actions of the magistrates and the overall aim of the expedition. Therefore, while he was in sympathy with Friends' principles on this matter, he was not totally in agreement with them.

Stephens, more than the other Friends, became involved in the politics of the day. He was the representative for Motueka in the Nelson Provincial Council and in the House of Representatives. Despite his earlier railings against the

Government, he was a personal friend of Governor Grey and on the occasions when Grey visited the Nelson area he would often stop at the summer home of the Stephens'. His dealings with Grey arean indication of closely he followed Friends' principles. In one instance Grey wished to reappoint him a Justice of the Peace, as the previous appointment had lapsed. Stephens declined, stating his appointment as Chief Surveyor would be a hindrance to his fulfilling his duty but also citing that as a J.P. he could be required to perform duties 'uhcongenial to his feelings'.[25] Exactly what these uncongenial duties were is hard to define. It may have been the taking of oath to the Queen, but this is unlikely for as far back as the late seventeenth century Quakers had been permitted to take a civil oath, although it was not until the 1870's that this was accepted amongst Quakers themselves. A liklier explanation may have been that as a Quaker he did not feel right about sitting in judgement on another human.

Evidence about the other members of the Society in Nelson at this time is fairly scant. What we do get is a picture of a close group who formed an unofficial and primitive, Meeting for Worship in Nelson. When Samuel Strong, a landholder and shipbuilder, arrived on the Bombay in December 1842, a regular meeting on Sundays was soon organized at his house. Of them, Issac Mason Hill remarked: "Met with S.Strong and family. I must acknowledge sitting in silence, though with only a few, to be a great privilege and all will find it who are absent from large meetings."[26] During the early years of the meeting and later in this period, it was

sometimes only two or three who gathered for worship. Strong was often absent on business, in fact Stephens notes that for a time he was at the goldfields in Melbourne. Tuckett and Cotterell (until the latter's death) were frequently in the countryside on survey work, and Stephens settled at Riwaka. Further depletion occurred when Tuckett left to survey Otago in February 1844. Nevertheless a group had been formed. There may have been more Quakers in Nelson at this time but they do not seem to have carried on their faith, perhaps because they were glad to be free of the restrictions placed upon them in England and joined another church. Issac Hill commented that those who had been Friends in England would be ashamed of those in New Zealand.[27] The group carried on despite the above mentioned losses until at least 1860, when Strong in a letter to Joseph B. Mather in clearly shows that the meeting was still going despite its smallness.[28]

The fact that a group such as this met despite a number of inhibiting factors, shows that the Society was moving forward in a small way. This willingness to carry on in the face of all this is best explained by Thompson (Nonconformity in the Nineteenth Century) who mentions four contributions that Nonconformist religions made to English Society. The fourth contribution they made best sums up Quakerism.

> The religion of commitment and action associated with Nonconformity has played an important part in national [English] and religious life. It is practically impossible to be an uncommitted or casual Nonconformist - certainly it was in the nineteenth century. This commitment was also carried over into a commitment to live one's religion in everyday life.[29]

This willingness to carry over into one's life a religious commitment can be seen in all the lives of the group, for example Tuckett's refusal to carry arms to the extent that his agreement with the directors of the New Zealand Company exempted him from carrying or training men in the use of guns. For this some branded him a coward.[30] It is also seen in Stephens' refusal to take the office offered him for whatever reason it may have been. (Also it can be seen in Thomas Mason whom I will discuss later in this chapter, in his dealings with the Maori during the 1840's and 50's.) One of the main reasons that the group in Nelson was able to carry this commitment over into the formation of a meeting is the intense attachment to the Society.This was something made up of many elements, one of which was the profound difference between Quakerism and other denominations (explained in a later chapter). These differences affected so many points of Quaker life, especially before 1860, that abandoning it after a lifetime of usage 'was to threaten one's whole sense of identity'.[31] It is this spirit of intense attachment that will characterise the Society in New Zealand and this is especially so in this early period in their history.

In other areas of New Zealand there were either not enough people to start a group or more often too much distance involved for formation to be possible. However the 'sense of identity' that Isichei talks of was very strong, for example they held meetings in the privacy of their own homes with only their families as attenders. At the very end of this period Joesph B. Mather of Tasmania asked Samuel Strong if a Meeting

for Discipline could be formed but Strong sadly replied:

> Thank you for your kind brotherly feeling and encouragement you have manifested towards us, in the Epistle sent at the same time [a personal letter to Strong] I would beg to say, that unless, we get an accession of members, I despair of a Meeting for Discipline, and unless an improvement takes place we shall I fear lose Wm. Groom, he often talks of leaving for want of something to do.[32]

At this stage the Nelson meeting had lapsed back to its origins, that of a private meeting which was held at Samuel Strong's house.

The important thing is that Friends in Tasmania actually asked if a Meeting for Discipline could begin, probably as a consequence of the visit seven years earlier of two English Friends, (Robert Lindsay and Frederick Mackie, who visited New Zealand in 1853 as part of a Ministry to Friends in Australia), who had proved a great help in providing a short-lived step forward in the development of the Society. This was the building of the first Meeting-house in New Zealand at Nelson. The building of this Meeting-house meant the Society had, in the opinion of these two Friends shown sufficient evidence for potential development and growth, and needed a place to focus. When Lindsay and Mackie visited, Issac Mason Hill and the Strong family were recorded by the two as the only Friends in Nelson. Despite this lack of numbers, Fletcher Jackson in his history commented that these English Friends believed that if a Meeting House was provided then others who did not feel free to enter a private house may have joined.[33] They then approached the government agent, Constantine Dillon, who put a slight obstacle in their way with his questioning

whether Friends with their small numbers could obtain the neccesary land.[34] The policy of the colonial government was to allow churches to take up land which had been alloted to them, and while theoretically a church the smallness of numbers may have hindered them in their intentions. However this was not the case. Dillion pointed out the eligible sections and also looked over the one of the sites with Friends.[35]

Eventually the pair purchased some land with a house that used to belong to J.S. Cotterell.[36] After much difficulty in getting the house on the site repaired, on 15 May 1853 a Meeting for Worship was held for the first time in a Meeting House. Unofficial though the meeting may have been, of it Robert Lindsay recorded: "It was a favourable season and was the cause for reverent thankfulness that we were honored with a sense of divine goodness. May it be a token of good for the future and that many now alive to the truth may be added to the two or three in this place."[37]

In the end this proved not to be the case, but what is significant is that Friends were willing to make this move in such a remote place as Nelson. One question which this raises is the influence of English Friends on those Friends in Nelson, with regard to the building of this meeting house and in general. It is a question which raises itself throughout this thesis and is important, as one can gauge the development of Friends by examinig the degree of English influence. This may seem an irrelevant issue for two reasons: the distance from Britain and the infrequency of visits by English Friends. (Indeed the question may be asked if their fleeting visits

made any impact at all.) Both factors may seem to negate the need to investigate the influence of these visiting Friends, but in fact these visitors were extremely important to Friends.

Before these two English Friends arrived there was a Meeting for Worship already established, a fact commented on more than once by Mackie in his Nelson journal. From one description he gave there seems to have been few attenders at a meeting,[38] and thus little thought would have been given to moving to larger premises. The meeting at first seems to have been quite content to stay as it had started. However when the two Friends suggested that they buy a section and build a meeting house the small group was quick to agree with them. Lindsay after much reflection concluded that there was a great need for a religious effort in Nelson and was particularly concerned for the isolated members of the Society in the Nelson district.[39] The English Friends were in effect discerning what help could given to the struggling Friends in New Zealand and the result was the Meeting house at Nelson. While it would be wrong to dismiss the idea that Friends would have built a Meeting House of their own accord, nevertheless the suggestion may not have been strong in their minds when they looked at their prospects for growth. The effort had been made to help them but the English Friends themselves realised that the help they could give was limited. The letter they sent to Nelson Friends' after they had left the town acknowledged that while they had helped the group to become a little stronger it was essentially up to them to do what they

could to keep the meeting as a going concern.[40] In this same letter they also mention the potential influence of Nelson Friends; obviously they already had some wider impact. One illustration is the way in which they supported other nonconformist groups to establish their churches and schools.[41]

Unfortunately the meeting house was abandoned in the 1860's but it is the first of many gestures of help which visiting English Friends were to give to New Zealand. An important point to notice is that it is not an attempt to influence or manipulate in any way the fortunes of the Society in New Zealand. These visits were designed to gauge the strength of the Society in New Zealand and to help in any way possible, particularly to provide a reminder of how Friends worshipped. The silent worship, and the solidarity it engendered, would have been sorely missed, along with the various meetings for business. All these were part of the everyday life of a Quaker in Britain. The other help the visitors gave was to re-establish connections between these Friends and those in England. Mackie commented in his journal that when they held a Meeting for Worship at Wairau on the First Day they were there that among those who attended this was the probably the first such meeting that had been held.[42] To help the Society develop the visiting English Friends could do very little. The Meeting house was a beginning and although a short-lived venture it did represent for the Friends in Nelson a small step towards imitating the form of worship they had known in England. The greatest need at this stage

was help in recruiting numbers. Even though they were small Nelson Friends were recognized by members abroad,[43] and in 1859, long after the meeting had disintegrated, the Continental Committee still sent an epistle to Samuel Strong.[44]

The help which the two Friends could give to Thomas Mason in Wellington was even less than they could give to Nelson Friends. With only Mason and his family in the region, the visitors could do little more than providing them with a sense of oneness with the Society through a Meeting for Worship.[45] The object of their visit was to 'Minister to Friends in Australia and New Zealand', and while in New Zealand they tried very hard under difficult circumstances to do so but the numbers in the end were against them.

One area where they helped Friends to develop was in the area of their peace testimony. While Mason and Tuckett would have been known locally most of the population would have still remained ignorant of Friends' Peace principles so wherever the visitors went they held meetings in halls and promoted these amongst other tenets of Friends. It was these two Friends who undertook the first official Peace mission, leaving some pamphlets with an army chaplain 'a serious and liberal minded individual', who would have allowed them to visit the soldiers but was overruled by the colonel of the regiment.[46] Although their peace stand was not new, this was the first time Friends had tried to communicate it directly to others.

We had our attention drawn to the soldiers at the

> Barracks, the principal part of the 65th regiment being stationed here, and should have been glad if way had opened for our calling on them also, but our application to the principal officer in command to do so, tho' very respectfully received was not attended with success, nevertheless we had an opportunity of supplying some who were desirious to receive them [Tracts on Friends teachings].[47]

In this brief encounter Mackie and Lindsay began the tradition of Friends' peace testimony that was to bear fruit much later and in doing so were of great service to Friends.

If Samuel Strong had with him in Nelson - even if it was for a short time - a small group to carry on Friends' principles, then Thomas Mason stands out as a lone beacon in the development of the Society in New Zealand. From his arrival in New Zealand in 1840 till late in the 1880's he was the only Friend in the Wellington region. Once again the way in which he interacted with the events that were happening around him gives an insight into how an individual can further the development of the Society in New Zealand. His letters were much used by Fletcher Jackson (in his history of Friends written in 1910) who found them valuable not only for the early history of New Zealand, but for the personal experiences of Mason as a Quaker during those times.[48] At first Mason's opinions were as those of Stephens in Nelson on the state of the white colonists in Wellington. Stephens had been most unsympathetic to them and especially with regards to their sloathsome ways and manners. Mason, in writing to his uncle, remarked on the laziness of the settlers, many of whom 'lived by their wits'. Working was quite unfashionable and any who were employed were unable to obtain payment because there was

no money to pay them.[49] His views on the government and of the people of his time were probably not much different from other 'gentleman' of his day, but commenting on Hobson he revealed himself to be different in his opinions from those around him. Principally he hoped that Hobson would restore law and build roads but he felt none of the animosity towards him that his fellow sttlers did.[50]

He was well aware of of the harm and exploitation that the Maori was experiencing under the English. "The reckless pursuit of wealth by unprincipled adventurers," he wrote to his uncle:

> has been followed by the introduction of an enormous quantity of spirits of which, amongst the natives (much more degraded since their intercourse with the British and American whalers) the effects have been disasterous in the extreme, depopulating some of the finest islands in the world [referring to the South Sea Islands] :Diseases, loathsome diseases, are now common where formally they were unknown.[51]

These insights into the behaviour of the British in the islands are carried on in his concern that New Zealand will be contaminated in the same way.[52] Mason's own dealings with the Maori were conducted in a manner quite unlike those of other white settlers.

The first encounters that Mason had with the Maori were during the unrest around Wellington which occurred in1845-6. These were once again linked with the New Zealand Company (although Mason was not involved with them to the same extent as Tuckett) and the issue of land was once again at the center of the disturbance. A direct result of it was Mason's departure to Hobart of himself, his wife and young family due

to his wife's nervous disposition. His conciliatory views and his honest dealings with the Maori meant that while he stayed in New Zealand his property and life were never endangered.[53] A similiar situation which had greater implications for him arose some years later when he had returned to New Zealand. The land which he had rented from the government in 1857 was improperly surveyed for him and when he had almost completed the erection of the woolshed and other buildings on the site, he was faced by a party of Maori who demanded payment for the timber used and rent for the occupation of the land. After it was ascertained that the land did belong to the Maori, Mason paid for the timber and arranged to pay for the rental of the land. This arrangement worked well for all concerned until in quick succession the chief and his brother, whose names are unrecorded, died, and another chief who had been conquered some years previously laid claim to the land. This was disputed by the tribe of the deceased chief, but the rival claimant charging Mason three hundred pounds for the time he had held the land, and then seizing two thousand of his sheep as a lieu. When news of this reached his neighbours they came to him full of sympathy and advice. Most of the advice was the same, to send for the Government to get the sheep back, but to one such as Mason this was futile advice, for if in regaining his sheep bloodshed was neccesary then he would rather have lost his sheep.[54]

The attitude he displayed towards the incident brought protests from these neighbours, who stated that if he let this pass without a show of force then the Maori would think

they could do the same sort of thing to them. Mason replied that he was not going to stand idly by but had a better way than theirs. This involved going to Nga Whiti, the chief involved, and reasoning with him. Mason was convinced there was some misunderstanding and told them not to fear as he would regain his sheep.[55] His neighbours thought this a preposterous statement and laughed at him. Their scorn would have been fueled by events which had occured before this. The monetary reimbursement which was demanded was raised to four hundred pounds, and as well, after removing the buildings from the land the chief, seized a further four thousand sheep. Once his buildings had been relocated Mason sent in a formal manner to demand the return of the sheep, but the chief refused unless his people were able: "to shear them at twenty shillings per hundred and a bonus of twenty bales of wool given to himself."[56] During this time a Church of England Missionary called and offered his services as a mediator.[57] While Mason accepted this offer he would not consent to the Chief's demands to shear the sheep. This and other attempts at intervention were unavoidable but as the account of the episode given by the Tasmanian Yearly Meeting states:

> Thomas Mason was resolved not to resort to violence, nor to suffer others to do so, on his behalf but to leave all in the hands of the Almighty, to work as he pleased for his assistance, being willing to suffer the loss of his property, if such were permitted, for he would not attempt to recover it by an unchristian act.[58]

Continuing his passive resistance for some months Mason finally caused the chief to relent and he sent word to Mason that his shepherd could have the sheep, if he came for them.

This he did and recovered them all except for 350 of them which were lost due to the features of the land where they were kept. On the question of the land which was also part of the dispute the other chiefs were anxious for Mason to occupy the ground, but Mason refused, stating he would only do so if the land ownership was settled among themselves.[59] Thus his passive resistance was vindicated in the sight of his neighbours, who were forced to admit:

> passive resistance was the best course that could have been adopted: and it was practical proof that the peaceable principles of Christianity are applicable to the greater as well as the lesser events of life and that a quiet firmness and reliance on Divine aid are more likely to conduce harmony and to bring even the most determined and savage amongst the Maori to listen to reason than any amount of physical force.[60]

This attitude was to save him again, when a short time after this incident he was working in his garden (it was his policy during these times of trouble to work close to the house), when he saw a party of Maori warriors making their way towards his house. Throwing down his tools, he went at once to his residence. He arrived before the party and his wife seeing him arrive came out to meet him just as the armed warriors came into sight. At the head of the party was a chief whom they knew by sight but had had little to do with. The reason for the Maori anger seems to have been because of an outrage committed the previous night, and they were prepared to avenge themselves on the first white people they came upon. Mason meet their anger with his usual kindness, and tried to appease the Chief. He thought he was succeding when his wife who was finding the ordeal hard to bear, suddenly hit the

chief full in the face.[61] Mason knew this was a fatal mistake and at a signal from their leader the rest of the party began to dance around the two as they faced him. Mason quickly apologised to the chief for his wife's action, while pointing out to the chief that there had been some provocation for it. He pleaded with the chief; he told how he always tried to be a friend to all his neighbours, whites as well as the Maori.

> Every moment they expected the signal to be given for their lives to be taken, and moment after moment went by, each of them seeming almost a lifetime of itself. Still the signal tarried; still the dancers continued their dance...Then he feeling further speech was useless, and hand in hand they waited for the last moment to come.[62]

Suddenly without a word the cheif turned to his men and the next moment they were filing away. One of the main reasons why they were not killed was because Mason refused to resort to violence, not only saving his own life but earning the respect of all. By living according to the principles that he had inherited, Mason furthered the Society in his own small way. It was not in the way of a growth in numbers but in respect of society's wider understanding of Quaker principles. For in later years the people of Wellington would hear more of Quakers in the region and many would think of 'Quaker Mason'. Thus a small foundation was begun by this one man that could be built upon in a much later period of time.

Unlike the Nelson Friends, Mason's Meeting for Worship which were held twice a week, were never attended by more than his immediate family, some of his servants and one or two of his neighbours. Nevertheless together with Masons' personal testimony, it showed promise for development of the Society

in the region. While Mason carried on the Quaker spirit in the wilderness, the same could not be said for others who Mason implies came to New Zealand. Mason's uncle asked him whether there had been any increase in the Society in the years that he had been there. To this Mason replied:

> I should say no - and as one reason why such is the case, I believe is a want of consistency it is the more to be regretted. Even some of those who occupy the highest stations are far from upholding the distinguishing characteristics of Friends even to the same extent as I have seen at home, undoubtedly the broad principles are acknowledged but few members (if any), act up to them.[63]

Probably Mason is talking of those people who were wealthy and like many wealthier Quakers in England during this time, they resigned their membership, gravitating towards Anglicanism as they grew wealthier. This change was often the product of social factors. Friends were not the only group of Dissenters to be struck by this trend. In other groups of Dissenters the wealthier families also tended to move towards the established churches. An example of this can be found amongst the Weslyans in New Zealand. As a denomination they often flourished in pioneer districts rather than settled ones. In Wanganui one particular paper, the Yeoman, pointed out that once Wesleyans moved up in the world, they attached themselves to the more 'aristocratic and influential churches'[64] For Friends in New Zealand this may have been the same, it certainly was the case in England. Even once the barriers to upward movement in society had disappeared and a Friend could become a member of Parliament or send his son to public schools and university, the 'Establishment', continued to draw them.[65]

The above explanation may provide one of the answers to the question of who these people described by Mason were, but by far a more plausible one is the same as that provided for the other Quakers who are alluded to in Nelson: that many may have come to New Zealand to escape the strictness of the life in England. One reason that strongly supports Mason's claim of a greater number of Friends in Wellington than are recorded is the problem of the geography of New Zealand, mentioned at the beginning of the thesis. Development of the Society at this stage in time in the life of New Zealand - even if there were a number of people in Wellington - would have been considerably hampered by the geography of the area. Added to this is that unlike other denominations which came to New Zealand at this time they had only settled in two areas. Also in any one area there were not the numbers to congregate and form a base in any one area. The reason that the Nelson meeting was able to organize itself so quickly was that it was the exception to the above rule in that it did have a number of Quakers in the same area and they lived very close to one another and to the town.

This was not the case in Wellington: Mason himself lived out in Taita, approximately 20 miles from Wellington, and while he does not mention where these other Friends lived, one can guess that they lived similar distances from Wellington. Mason's only form of transport in the early days was to canoe down the Hutt River to Wellington. This he did infrequently to get supplies and mail and weighed against the amount of work on his land he lost, It was impractical and not viable for

him to go to Wellington more than once a month. The problems of geography seem to have been solved only in the very late stages of the period under study, namely the latter part of the years 1911-20. In 1886 Ann Fletcher Jackson mentions the problems of distance in connection with Alfred Goldsbury who lived in Waiuku. Goldsbury rode forty miles to the meeting and did not expect to return home until 2 a.m. the next day.[66] Her wish was that they had more of this spirit of earnestness from others.[67] In the early years of the Wellington colony among these Quakers this spirit was either lacking completely or due to the difficulties of travel and lack of time could not be exhibited.

A further reason which presents itself is that because of their scattered nature coupled with small numbers, they may not have known of the existence of one another. Again this is not confined to the early period. The revival in Auckland in 1885 was the focal point of a gathering, at which it was realised by some that they had lived in close proximity to other Friends and had not realised it.[68] This was in late 1885 approximately thirty years later when there were a great many more Friends and the communication and transport networks were much improved, from the primitive links that went with the early life of the colony.

A clue to understanding the real nature of Mason's comment can be found in studying the location of the Quakers who kept their membership. Obviously there being no recognized Meeting for Discipline in New Zealand when they arrived meant they could not transfer their membership to it, as they were

able to do in later years. The Meeting for Discipline was the local executive branch of Quakerism, and was responsible for all the business of the local Friends community, such as marriages, births and so on. This meant that they kept their membership with their local meeting in England, and if they did so, when Mackie and Lindsay visited the Wellington region, they would have been attracted to the meetings these two held and would have been mentioned by them. This does not seem to have been the case and while, at one meeting the attendance was so large many were unable to obtain a seat,it is not recorded that any Friends attended it.[69] There is no mention in this or any other example of any Quakers at the meeting and during the visits made around Wellington they do not mention any other Quakers apart Mason and one other who may not have been a Friend. This evidence leads to the conclusion that in actual fact there was in the Wellington region only one Quaker family, that of Mason, and that what Mason was talking of was that people in general were not leading a life expected of Quakers (which is what Stephens was saying of the settlers in Nelson). Lindsay and Mackie provide final proof against reading the passage in any other way by providing a list of Friends in New Zealand which Mackie compiled:-

Fig 1: Members of Society of Friends in New Zealand 1853

Name	Residence	Where from
Hill, Issac Mason	Nelson	Birmingham
Mason Thomas,Jane his wife and six children.	River Hutt	York
Strong Samuel,Martha his wife and two children.	Nelson	Frome

Besides 13 others who are or have been in one way or another connected with Friends.

(Source: Portfolio Series 8/1 MS Papers 2597)

Twenty-six is in fact a significant number, for such a small group as Friends were. Other religious groups even at this early stage in New Zealand's history would have found this number insignificant but when Mason talks about there being a large number of Friends in New Zealand for him 26 number is large.

It is Friends as individuals who give first voice to the Society's peace testimony. Mason and Tuckett in Nelson were firm practitioners of Friends' peace principles. These were to be brought to greater prominence later, but it had its genesis with these few. Mason remarked that the effects of the war were already marked and that both European and Maori were returning to idle and disruptive habits. This he reflected was a result of the waning of the missionary influence and that if this was the state of affairs at the beginning of the war he hoped for a speedy end to it.[70] Mason was willing to risk his life for his principles as is seen in the incidents described earlier. It is this dedication to Friends' principles that kept the Society alive in these early days. J.J. Neave who visited New Zealand in the 1870's makes this clear when commenting on his visit to Wellington; London Yearly Meeting records: "At Taita, near Wellington, he met with his dear friends Thomas and J.Mason, who have stood nearly alone as Friends, through a long course of years, and their consistent upright conduct has brought them the esteem of those around

them."[71]

The involvement of individual Friends with events described in this chapter shows how strongly they identified with the Society. In the case of both Mason and the group at Nelson this identification is plainly strong. It was this strength that saw the Society through the first early years. There was virtually no growth either from further immigration as there would be in later years, nor from "convincement". Those who carried on the principles of Friends were often isolated, as was Mason in Wellington, or from any other groups and all were in isolation from England. The dedication to retaining their membership and their beliefs was to characterize Friends, as the Society was always small and relied on individuals who maintained themselves as Friends despite their isolation.

During this period the first of many English Friends visited New Zealand. Robert Lindsay and Frederick Mackie went through most of New Zealand, however they only stayed any length of time in Wellington and Nelson. One of the main tasks of this thesis will be to examine the influence that the English Society had on New Zealand Friends. With the building of the Meeting House it could be imagined the Society was to become large but this is not to be the case. This visit is the first of many which would seek to help Friends as they struggled to develop. The attempts made during this period began with hope but in the end were less successful than anticipated as numbers involved were just too small.Yet the the signs were there that all was not despair and gloom. By

1860 while the Society appeared to be in a sad state of affairs (with no meetings and in an unofficial census, only thirteen members) but in reality the Society was on a solid footing. It had committed individuals such as those I have mentioned for whom their religion, despite the small numbers, meant a great deal. The geography of the country to which these early Quakers came was entirely unsuited to any kind of social intercourse such as they were used to in England. Individuals were the Society and they kept it alive by their deeds and words. This was true of all religions in Nelson at the time and Friends helped others to build up their strength while doing so themselves.[72] The individuals studied in this chapter were to the forefront of the drive to establish the Society in New Zealand, even if this does not seem to have been their goal and by the end of this period the Society has a tentative spring-board for further development.

> To preserve their religion in the new world was to many a sacred trust. Until churches [meeting houses] were established they all felt keenly the lack of that spiritual comfort to which they were wont to turn in the ordinary course of their daily life. But how much more keenly did they feel their deprevation at times of family rejoicing such as baptisms and marriages, and at times of sorrow and death![73]

ENDNOTES

1 Portfolio Series 8/1 MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library (hereafter ATL)

2 Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p.xix

3 Allan R.M. Nelson: A History of early Settlement p.246

This is the best book I have found on the Wairau massacre, it brings together a wide range of stories on the actual masscre.

4 Miller J. Early Victorian New Zealand: A Study of racial attitudes 1839-1852 p.64

5 Miller Op.cit.

6 Allen, Nelson: A History p.237

7 Ibid. p.239 8 Ibid. p.241

9 Simpson T. Te Riri Pakeha: The White Mans Anger p.64

10 Ibid. p.65

11 Ruth Allan as mentioned above or Simpson's book also mentioned above.

12 Broad L. The Jubilee History of Nelson 1842-1892 p.78

13 Nelson Examiner 5 Aug. 1843 ATL

14 Paper by Frederick Tuckett on New Zealand Company 15 July 1848 Hocken Library

15 Miller, Early Victorian New Zealand p.121

16 Ibid. p.122 17 Ibid. p123

18 Miller Op. cit.

19 Allan, Nelson:A History p.277

20 Stephens S. Extracts from Letters and Journals 1842-55 Vol.1 p.20 ATL

Stephens came to New Zealand as a surveyor in 1840 and stayed on until his death in 1855 although a Friend by birth he seems not to have continued after his arrival in New Zealand. However he does still provide some interesting insights into early New Zealand

history for despite not continuing to associate himself with Friends his perspective on events and details continues to be that of a Friend.

21 Stephens Op.cit. 22 Ibid. p.116

23 Stephens Extracts Vol.2 p.414 ATL 24 Ibid. p.414-5

25 Ibid. p.302-3

26 Hill I.M. Diary 1843-44 10th mon. 2nd. 1843
This is the only part of what was once a large diary kept by Hill that survives. The rest having been lost when he crossed a swollen stream and lost his pack.

27 Ibid. 3rd. mon. 10th 1844

28 Strong S. to Joesph B. Mather 5th,4th mon. 1860 Series 33/3/2 MS Papers 2597 ATL

29 Thompson D.M.(ed.) Nonconformity in the Nineteeth Century p.17

30 Broad Jubilee History of Nelson p.78

31 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.66

This book although a study of Victorian England is useful in that one can draw a great many comparisions with New Zealand Quakerism from it.

32 Strong S. to Joesph B. Mather 5th, 4th mon. 1860 ATL

33 Jackson F. The Past History of Friends in New Zealand File 33/8/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL. p.21

This paper was presented by Fletcher Jackson at the 1910 Friends Conference and is useful because it provides a Friends view of their own history.

34 Mackie F. Journal 1853 MS Papers 805 ATL p.163

This journal was kept by Mackie during his journey through New Zealand in 1853 and provides a unique view of early colonial society and Friends place in it.

35 Mackie Op.cit. 36 Ibid. p.178

37 Lindsay R. as quoted by Fletcher Jackson In Past History of Friends p.22 MS Papers 2597 ATL

38 Mackie Journal 1853 p.174 ATL

39 Rigg T. History of the Society of Friends (Quakers) in Nelson File 33/2/4 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.4

40 Letter of Robert Lindsay and Frederick Mackie to Nelson Friends 25 June 1853 MS Papers 2597 ATL

41 Allan, Nelson: A History p.175

42 Mackie Journal 1853 ATL p.148

43 Continental Cttee MS Minutes (1842-1868) MS Micro 647 ATL p.52

> The Continental Committee is a committee set up by the Meeting fo Sufferings in 1817,and later known as the Continental Committee,was responsible for maintaining oversight of Quaker groups overseas where there was no settled Yearly Meeting.Until the beginning of the twentieth century Friends in Australasia came under the care of the Continental Committee.Following the establishment of Australia General Meeting in 1902 however,it was decided on by Meeting for Sufferings in Oct 1903 to appoint a separate committee on Australasian affairs and in 1906 this committee also took over from the Continental Committee responsibility for correspondence with N.Z. Friends.

44 Ibid. p.141

45 Mackie, Journal 1853 ATL p.134

46 Lindsay R. Memorandum Vol.10 MS Micro 647 ATL p.133

47 Lindsay Op.cit.

48 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.12

49 Mason T. Papers: Letters to Mother, Uncle MS Papers 54 ATL p.6

50 Mason Op.cit 51 Ibid p.20 52 Mason Op.cit.

53 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.13

54 Rutter E. True Tales of the Maori Series 33/3/9 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.6

55 Ibid. p.6-7

56 Yearly Meeting, Tasmania Appendix 12th March 1862 p.4

57 Yearly Meeting, Tasmania Op.cit. 58 Ibid.p.4-5

59 Ibid. p.5-6

60 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.16-17

61 Rutter, True Tales of the Maori p.11-12 62 Ibid. p.12

63 Mason, Papers River Hutt 9th March 1851 p.31 ATL

64 Arnold P. The Patterns of Denominationalism in Later Victorian New Zealand In Nichol C. & Veitch J. (eds.) Religion in New Zealand 2nd. ed. p.107

65 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.142

66 Lury S.J. Ann Fletcher Jackson Pioneer Resident Minister in the Society of Friends, New Zealand p.16

67 Lury Op.cit.

68 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1886 MS Micro 647 ATL p.50

69 Lindsay Memorandum Vol.10 MS Micro 647 ATL p.112

70 Mason T. to J.B. Mather Hutt 4.2.1851 ATL

71 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1871 MS Micro 647 ATL p.73

72 Allan, Nelson:A History p.166

73 Allan Op.cit.

CHAPTER TWO

A STEP FORWARD: FROM INDIVIDUALS TO GROUPS 1860-1880

In the last chapter we saw how individuals were the heart of the Society and how from their example of adherence in the face of great difficulties they provided a small yet solid base for growth. This chapter does not see the demise of the part played by particular individuals. In fact for the whole of this period they again play an important part in keeping the Society alive. Now we have these individuals beginning small groups which spring up - especially in Auckland - as more Friends immigrate to New Zealand. These groups were unstable and depended on whether the group who gathered were cohesive for a relatively long period or whether indviduals moved on. This will be seen of the Auckland group which was particularly volatile.

Steady growth in Friends' numbers was a feature of this period. For the census of 1861 the number of recorded Friends had risen to 70.[1] In 1864 this had increased to 128[2] and from this time the population of Friends increased steadily to 146[3] through 201[4] hitting a slight downturn in 1874 at 156[5] finally stabilizing at 183[6] in 1878. These are the figures on paper and the question this raises is how many were actually Friends. A detailed answer is not part of this thesis but must be left to someone else, although one answer was suggested in the last chapter. Geography influenced whether those who

claimed to be Quakers were in fact active. However no records were kept by Friends in New Zealand for this period and what scant records that are available are sketchy notes kept by visiting Friends so it is difficult to get a true picture. One thing to note is that any person claiming in the census to be a Friend, as with any who stated they were 'Jehovah's witness or Christadelphian', would be deeply committed to involvement in that group. This does not mean that they were 'more truthful' than the average person who belonged to a major dehomination but that Friends meant something different.[7]

Another question raised by these increasing numbers is "Why did they come to New Zealand?" Again in the last chapter a speculative answer was given on this question but one aspect is clear. Friends in New Zealand were not attempting to follow in the footsteps of William Penn, who had set up the province of Pennsylvania. He had done this without arms, buying the land from the Indians as if he were dealing with another white citizen,[8] unlike the less scrupulous behaviour of other settlers. However, as we have seen, New Zealand Friends were to have ample opportunities to show that their peace principles could be applicable to the whole of life, enabling various transactions to be made, without the use of force.[9]

One further result of the increase in population wasthat Friends now were found scattered in a wider area of New Zealand. By 1871 when J.J.Neave first visited, he could talk of seeing Friends in Auckland, the East Coast of the North Island, Christchurch, Dunedin and other centres in the South Island. In 1874 a member of the Continental Committee J.

Esverfield could report that as well as an epistle to the Tasmania Yearly Meeting, Epistles had been addressed to Friends in New Zealand and Queensland.[10] With numbers on the increase the whole outlook was much brighter for Friends.

Individuals now began to appear in areas outside Wellington and this is the appropriate place to begin the chapter, starting once more with Thomas Mason. Mason had shown that he was willing to carry out Friends' principles even in the face of death, and in the incident to be discussed in this chapter we again see him remaining steadfast in his belief in Friends' peace principles.

The Tasmanian Yearly Meeting reported that all men between 16 and 40 were called out for active service and that by the Militia Act (of 1864) Friends had not been exempted. This meant that Masons' two sons had been enrolled as militiamen, and, although they refused to serve, there was a friendly feeling towards them so the case was not pressed. Instead it was forwarded to the government.[11] The military authorities stated that the Masons to be sworn in, drilled, and if fighting broke out they were to be used as clerks.[12] When Mason heard of this he went immediately to the Major commanding the regiment to state the impossibility of he and his sons assenting either to his wishes or obeying a Military Officer.

The officer's solution to this was to grant him an absence of leave, with the qualification that Friends were the only ones he would allow to make this same plea.[13] However the Militia Act left the inferior officer no choice but to

prosecute Mason and his sons. With this went the provision that the Provincial Authorities promised to endorse any application Mason might make to the Government to try to obtain an exemption. However for Mason this was a real test as present views such as his at this time required a great deal of courage and faith, both of which he had, coupled with the reputation he had already gained for himself. For this reason the Magistrate who prosecuted stated that if they had been fined no-one would have been found to issue a warrent to seize their goods,[14] and Mason and his sons were relieved of duty under the Act.[15] From an incident such as this one can see that individuals still had power to enhance and develop the reputation of Friends in New Zealand.

During the 1860's when immigration of Friends into New Zealand was increasing, Land Wars were in progress. On hearing of the Maori situation,[16] reason English Friends felt it necessary to issue a pamphlet through the Meeting for Sufferings entitled 'Address to Emigrants' and another, issued by the Yearly Meeting, entitled, 'Address on the Conduct of Christian Nations towards the Less Enlightened', which had been issued in 1852. Through these two pamphlets the Yearly Meeting, for the first time, took a real interest in the affairs of New Zealand and directly sought to set out some sort of guidelines for their members here. This involvement was to grow as the years passed and more members settled in New Zealand but for now it was restricted to instances such as this, and more directly through visits of Friends who went to minister in countries such as New Zealand.

During this period there were four visits by English Friends but again it is important to realise that these visits were not any attempt to influence the Society in New Zealand. They were merely attempts by the English Society to establish to what state the Society in New Zealand had developed and to see if there was anything they could do to help the Society in a practical way. The frequency of their visits can, one feels, be directly linked to the growth in numbers of Friends during this period. In 1871 in Auckland province there were purportedly 103[17] Friends but it must be stressed that this number is misleading as the facts will show.

In 1870 Joesph Neave visiting Auckland found 24 in the Province plus another 28 who were attached to Friends in some way.[18] This adds up 52 or approximately half of the census figure. The discrepency in numbers is as hard to explain in this period as it was in the last when discussing Thomas Mason's comments. In the case of these figures a most plausible explanation is provided by Neave in a description of his journey. In the account of his travels around Auckland in 1870-1 to the Yearly Meeting Neave often talks of the distances he had to travel to reach Friends. After arriving in Te Arai and visiting several Friends there, he and his companion crossed to the Nova Scotia settlement, a distance of twenty-two miles where they were met by W.A. Herson and his wife.[19] He travelled on to Mangonui to Joesph Sturge and from here a further twenty-four miles to Awanui to visit Ephriam Shannon.[20] After completing other visits he returned to Shortland and hence on to Auckland. In total the journey

undertaken was 220 miles in distance, all on foot, and took nine weeks to complete.[21] This was not the only area that experienced communication problems but it highlights the difficulties that Friends in general experienced. There may well have been more than 52 Friends living in the Auckland Province. The fact was that to reach many of them may have required even greater feats of travel which were beyond Neave's capabilities.

Immigration was and for the next twenty years would be, the main factor in any growth that occured. Due to this,one finds that during Neave's visit he went to places that quite naturally Lindsay and Mackie did not even consider. For the first time we find Friends mentioned in Napier, Christchurch and Dunedin. Napier is of some interest as it would, in later years, become a minor centre of Friends with many of those mentioned by Neave still taking an active part in Friends' activities in later years.[22] Neave commented on those he met, providing for us the first appearance of what can be described as the English perspective on New Zealand Friends. Neave's comments were made from the perspective of a Friend who came from a settled structure of meetings which could be travelled to with much more ease than he was experiencing. Adaption to the new situation was beginning to occur among New Zealand Friends, but for English Friends such as Neave and those who will be discussed in later chapters, there was only one way to view events and that was from the perspective reflecting the society and expectations from which they had come.

Though Friends in new areas were few in number, they

carried on Friends' practices regardless of their lack of numbers. Alfred Beck, on his visit to Christchurch in 1875, commented that, while they found only a few Friends when they held a meeting at John Wilson's house, those who attended decided to keep the meeting up.[23] Short-lived though this meeting was, the willingness was there to make a start at some form of Meeting. In Dunedin at the same time there also seems to have been an influx of Friends, described the Quaker Chronicle in relation to Neave and Sharp's 1882 visit to some Friends whom they had first visited twelve years before.[24] The advancement of Friends' numbers helped considerably in the development of the Society in Dunedin. In the Auckland Province where the growth in numbers was the greatest, it was this growth that led to the organization of the first, though primitive and unofficial, Meeting for Worship and Discipline.

This Meeting was a foreshadowing of the more organised and structured successor. J.J.Neave came across the first of these Meetings when he was travelling in the far north. This was held in the home of George Whitmore in Onehunga which later moved to the home of Rebecca Boot and her daughters.[25] It seems that the meeting had moved already in the short time that it had been established but this was a typical pattern as many people at this time moved after only a short period in a certain place. The meeting therefore adapted itself to Friends' movements. It was very likely that Friends had moved from the former place where the meeting was held and that others had moved closer to the residence of Rebecca Boot.It is important to notice that a meeting of some description had

been established before Neave arrived. This desire to meet is an important factor in the growth of Friends, and from these Meetings for Worship came a desire for something more, as Neave discovered. When in Auckland in June of 1871, he and another Friend, Dr. Preston walked to Remuera to 'the long-talked of meeting' to be held there.[26] This meeting seems to have taken place where as many Friends as possible were to gather and try to organize some sort of Meeting for Discipline. Alexander Fox was appointed as clerk and the first objective was the reading from the Book of Discipline which covered the position of these Friends.[27] After much discussion and the reading of Epistles which had been sent by the Meeting for Sufferings and various other Meetings for Discipline, they decided to establish a Three Months Meeting.[28] While this course of action was taken with good intentions they also realised the weak position they were in especially because of distance.(This was mentioned by J.J.Neave.[29])

The hindrance caused by geographic problems meant that there was only one further meeting held. When Alfred Wright when visited New Zealand in 1874-5, he found only four Friends living in Auckland, with no meeting, and a further few widely scattered about the province.[30] Despite this he held a meeting at George Whitmore's house which was nine miles distance from Auckland. Wright, like Neave, experienced great difficulties trying to reach some distant Friends. In winter he found the roads unusable which made it impossible for him to visit all those he wished to,[31] and all year round, the time it took for Friends to travel these distances meant the continuance of any

meeting was impractible. The meeting which Neave and Preston attended would have been larger but as Neave reported on arriving back in Auckland they found that A.P. Jacobs and two others had been unable to attend due to unfavourable winds.[32] The dedication of Jacobs is to be applauded, for not only did he have to undertake a boat journey but had to walk twenty miles by foot to reach the meeting. With the movement of the Boot sisters to Hokitika on their marriage to Robert and Arthur West,[33] there seems to have been no-one else willing to take on the responsibility of the meeting, particularly because the distances involved in travelling. In fact, when the Boot family moved, they were the only remaining members of the small meeting as both Fox and Preston had died.[34]

Despite these obstacles, it is obvious that Friends wanted to organize the meetings to resemble something of what they had known. Ellen Fox of Thames twice mentions an attempt to gather Friends in the area together for a meeting, at the time of J.J.Neaves' visit:

> Our last first-day afternoon we held a meeting in kitchen. The meeting was advertised in the papers, inviting Friends and those interested in Friends to come, and we were ten, viz J.J.N, Wm. Beale, John West, Mansfield Baker, A. and self and four non-members. We did not know there were any until these and now we find there are more.[35]

This sentiment was to be expressed again and again: that as a small group in a colonial society they experienced a chronic lack of communication and were usually unaware of the existence of each other until they met face to face. From the visit of Neave there came a glimmer of hope for a meeting. Ellen Fox, in her diary in 1870, wrote of an attempt to hold a

meeting on Sunday evenings where a bible reading would be followed by a time of silence.[36] Unfortunately as with the effort in Auckland, this meeting was also to be short-lived. The former was in fact held only once, because many of the members moved to other vicinities or died, as in the case of Ellen Fox's husband and the Dr.Preston mentioned. Another place which is mentioned as having a meeting established for a short time is Hokitika.[37] This meeting began up when the Boot sisters moved to Hokitika with their husbands. The movement of these Friends to Hokitika exhibited a pattern which can be seen in later periods of time. This was the trend of people in general to move about the country as economic conditions dictated. By doing so however they played havoc with any plans to set up any permanent meeting in Auckland or elsewhere as their movements meant there was no solid base to work from.

In 1874 as directed by the Yearly Meeting the Continental Committee sent to Hokitika an Epistle, one of the seven they sent to various members in New Zealand.[38] It seems that upon moving to the region the two couples gathered round them a small group of Friends and because of this closeness there came into being a Meeting. The position of these Friends and their numbers was listed by Joseph Neave in a list of members he compiled in 1874 after his visit here.

Fig.2 Friends living in and around Hokitika

Province of Westland

Francis Beal(e)	wife and son	Six Mile Beach Hokitika
JoesphBeale	wife and son	Waimea near

was not to happen in the Southland region. No meeting ever resulted in Invercargill and the visits by these English Friends were the only contact they had with Friends.

This isolation was shared by Friends who settled on the East Coast of the North Island. John and Sarah Chambers took up land in the Gisborne district and like Thomas Mason they kept faith with Friends principles, especially those of non-violence, becoming known for their friendly relations with the Maori people during the years of conflict. In the 1860's and 70's close connections with another family, the Holdsworths, were established when seven years after his first visit to New Zealand John Holdsworth returned to marry the Chambers' daughter Margaret. In later years, through his many journeys between New Zealand and England, John Holdsworth became a symbol of the links between English and New Zealand Quakers.[41] For Friends not as fortunate as this the only link with others was the visiting English Friends. Later, three other Friends families arrived in the region, the Richardsons, Hutchinsons and the Kenways.

If there were so many Friends in the East Coast region then one wonders why no meeting of these Friends was attempted. Once again the answer to this is the nature of the geography and the travel conditions of the time. The region was renowned in these early days for its thick bush. Add to this the time it would have taken to get to any central spot from these various isolated localities and the logic of why there were no meetings becomes evident. The only way Friends gained knowledge of each other was through the visit of

travellers such as J.J. Neave.

Another place which is first mentioned in this period is Taranaki. In 1877 Alfred Muggeridge came to New Zealand and a little later his brother Albert joined him. As seems to have been the way with many Friends when they arrived in New Zealand, Alfred was first a farmer, but later he took to road contracting and became a road surveyor for the Hawera County Council; Friends who arrived in New Zealand expecting to begin life as they had left off were in for a large shock. The non-equivalence of occupations would have been the first shock to hit some of them, especially in the area of farming. The equating of occupation with social position was not as clear in New Zealand as it was in England during this period.(What is intended in this study is not a rigorous social analysis and comparison of New Zealand occupations but merely a useful insight into the adaptations which New Zealand Friends made to the society they found themselves in.)

As Elizabeth Isichei explains, the individual's occupation can often in fact tell us little about his/her social and economic position. "As the Registrar-General complained in 1911, 'The farmer for instance may farm 10 acres or 1000, and the draper or iron-puddler may be the head of a large establishment or his lowest paid assistant or labourer'."[42] While this may have been so for England, the task of doing so in New Zealand is slightly more difficult. The system that Isichei adopted to put Quakers into classes has some applications to New Zealand but the great disadvantage comes when one equates the occupation described

in England and in New Zealand. It is a four-fold system, which when applied to the Quaker population in four different periods, reveals, [comments Isichei]: "the Quakers' continuing image of themselves as a predominantly middle-class body."[43] For each period Isichei studied, the members of Class I - the gentleman, bankers, merchants, farmers and professional people - form roughly half of the total. The second largest is always Class II which comprises the retailers, independent craftsmen, foremen and clerks. For her surveys there were members of Classes III and IV, which were the semi-skilled and the unskilled workers; however these figures were never high. The only list of figures for this period in New Zealand, those of 1874, which reveal any occupations make interesting reading when put into the classes which Isichei has used.

Fig 3:-

Occupations of Friends as Listed in J.J. Neaves List of 1874

Class I	Number
gentlemen	0
manufaturer,mineowner,shipowner	0
banker,stockbroker	0
professional	2
merchant	0
landowners	9
Class II	
retailer,small entreprenuer	6
commercial traveller	1
independent craftsmen	2

Class IV (small but negligible class of unskilled)

sailor	2

Not classified because of Ambiguity of Description

ironmonger,surveyor	2

(Sources: Structure as per Isichei Victorian Quakers, numbers per J.J. Neaves Membership List 1874 MS Micro 647)

If these figures are to be taken as a full picture, then the profile of Friends in New Zealand is not too much different to that which they had in England. However, this is a false assumption to make. If the eleven members of Class I were given their real status in the context of New Zealand Society of the time then most would probably fall into Class II and the landowners instead of being in Class I would more than likely be of the same class.

Isichei contends that for her analysis the following is true.

> The social structure of Quakerism, as revealed in this analysis, is precisely opposite to that of the general population. The 'labouring classes' were frequently estimated at 70 per cent of the total population in Victorian England. In the Society of Friends, the largest single group was Class I.[44]

Farmers may have come to be considered to be in Class I in later years but at this point in time it is hard to make them of equal Class in New Zealand, and the same can be said of the second class, this is why they may fit together in Class II. The purpose of such analysis is to reinforce the obstacles that Friends had in finding the time to organize meetings let alone attend them. In England Friends whose occupations fell into Classes I and II were members of the leisured class who could afford both the time and the money to attend meetings

and become involved with the Society whole-heartedly. There was such a thing as a working class Quaker in England but very little is known about them. The difference in New Zealand Society is that despite some slight comparisions between the classes, the Society in New Zealand was made up of working-class people. At this time there were very few people who had the leisure time to travel in New Zealand whether they were Quakers or not. Therefore when a majority of the Quakers who were in New Zealand were spread throughout both islands it meant that without close proximity to one another the likelihood of them having the time to attend a meeting was virtually nil.

Isichei revealed in her research that, although the analysis confirmed what Friends thought of themselves, it also revealed the existence of Quakers who did not fit into the pattern. These were Friends whose occupations were bricklaying and agricultural labouring.[45] These people had little leisure time, which was needed to attend meetings, and it is thus not surprising that they are absent from records. The history of New Zealand Friends during this period is a history of those who did not, like those above, have any leisure and if they did manage to secure any leisure time then they had so far to travel to these infrequent meetings that it was not worth the effort. Thus for isolated families such as those on the East Coast of the North Island, their proximity to one another provided no guarantee that a meeting would eventuate. The only confidence with which one could say a meeting would have any chance of beginning, and then continuing on for any period of

time, was if the participants in this meeting all lived in the same city, and even if this happened it was still not an absolute certainty that the meeting would survive.

There were four visits by English Friends to New Zealand during this period but the key visit came in 1870-1 when J.J. Neave visited. Neave travelled extensively in the Auckland Province and to several other parts of New Zealand. This visit and those of other Friends who visited New Zealand were very much fact-finding missions. It had been approximately twenty years since the last visit to Friends in New Zealand and the Yearly Meeting would have been anxious to ascertain what, if any, growth or development had taken place. Along with this function these visiting Friends would have looked to help New Zealand Friends in any way possible In this capacity J.J. Neave seems to have been a tower of strength. To the fragile newly formed meetings he seems to have played a vital part in trying to set them on a more secure foundation. This is especially true of meetings in Auckland Province which were unorganized and unsure whether they could continue. It seems that Neave was eager to meet with any little groups of Friends that had formed and was willing to undergo quite arduous journeys to accomplish this goal.[46] The main thrust of Neave's visit seems to have been to try to organize the various small meetings for worship into one central one based in Auckland. Representative of these is the one which was held at George Whitmore's house.[47] It seems that initially he was successful in his mission, as a 'Three Months Meeting', as it was called by Fletcher Jackson, was begun. Despite such initial success

in the long term it was never to be a going concern (for the reasons mentioned above). What the slight success of his venture does is to foreshadow the eventual success of another attempt made in 1885.

The contributing factor to the demise of the meeting was of course the numbers, but despite this, and the long distances that neeeded to be travelled, it is important to note that Friends were willing to make the attempt to gather together in some form of organized meeting. An example of this is the meeting started in Remuera, which continued for some months, and where as mentioned previously a 'Three Months Meeting of Friends' was begun.[48] In outlining the history of this small meeting it has become apparent that Joesph Neave had an important role of support and encouragement. The move Auckland Friends made to organize a meeting would have undoubtedly pleased Neave immensely and he would have done all in his power to help the fledgling meeting. However he would also have gone along with whatever the small meeting, which made this move, had decided. One of the most important decisions made by the meeting was where it was to be held. This was fixed, after some debate, in Auckland, for this was seen as a central locality for the meeting.[49]

One key reason why these meetings were short-lived and never established themselves was that Friends like other New Zealanders were subject to the restlessness that was a part of colonial life at the time. It was not unusual for immigrants and change places and occupations several times. Once example of such an immigrant is a seamstress named Catherine Ralfe

whose occupation and address changed several times as she sampled colonial life in several provinces before retiring with her equally well travelled sister-in-law to Stratford.[50] The Boot sisters, while not quite having the same record as Mrs Ralfe do provide us with an example of Friends of similar experience. The breakup of the Auckland meetings can also be attributed to the movement of Friends from one area to another even inside the province. Not all of this movement was voluntary. While the Boot sisters moved to Hokitika on their marriage, their husbands may well have moved there because of gold discoveries. These caused massive immigrations wherever a new goldfield was opened up.[51] For many Friends who came to on the constant stream of organized immigration during this time their first stop may not have been first option. An example of this is provided by the Albertland settlement.[52] The settlers who were to go to Albertland had arrived in New Zealand only a short time when they realized that the settlement was not likely to prove viable. The land they had been promised was described to them as an area of wilderness which was 'largely unsurveyed and almost completely roadless'. Further, no-one was interested in transporting them to their base camp on the Oruawharo river and whatever transport they did choose involved a long dangerous and time consuming journey.[53] Together these facts attributed to the loss of approximately half those who were to have settled in Albertland. Of those who did travel to the area less than half remained.[54] One Friend who may have been a member of either party was George Whitmore whom Neave visited in 1871. Neave described as one of

those who had gone out with those who were to settle in the 'Non-Conformist ' settlement but that as it had been a failure the party which he had come with had scattered.[55]

Any Friends' meeting started in this climate would have little chance of surviving, but the pattern of settler establishment and consolidation which came with the opening of these new lands had with it a third component, adaption.[56] Friends were no different from any other denomination in putting themselves on a firm footing. Archdeacon Govett built the historic St. Mary's parsonage in New Plymouth at his own expense, while in Thames it was only the fact that he owned shares in lucrative goldmine that enabled the vicar of St. George parsonage to build his church and home for his family.[57] Adaptability was found in a number of ways in New Zealand

> Henry Harper preached in a Canterbury woolshed; early Thames ministers used the courthouse. Settlers removed from all possibility of attendance at formal worship had to adjust to a religious, though not a spiritual, isolation.[58]

Friends'meetings adapted in the same way to the needs of Friends. If a meeting broke up in one place then it may well have sprung up in another; indeed this was a feature of Friends' meetings, not just in this period but much later as well. Thomas Mason certainly learnt to adapt in view of his isolation and despite the loneliness of his home and the fact that it consisted soley of his family,[59] a meeting was kept up for a number of years. When Wright and Beck visited in 1875 they were the only contacts Mason had with other Friends. These two visitors described how for thirty years he had kept

up his meeting, which attests to his adaptability. The same sort of adaptability was also shown by Friends on the Eat Coast of the North Island. The greatest point that Neave noted in 1870, was that they continued to feel 'one with Friends', despite their isolation.[60] Despite a number of obstacles Friends were learning to live with what they found to be their position and adapted their circumstances to their religious needs.

The sentiments shown above make it clear that Friends themselves saw the obstacles they faced in setting up any meetings. Also they realised the limitations that were placed on them. Despite this they seem determined to carry on if at all practicable, and if at all possible to try to organize a Meeting for Discipline. The scattered nature of their members made it an almost impossible task but the attempt was still made[61] This spirit of trying to organize meetings wherever possible was carried on in Hokitika, as mentioned earlier. It seems the meeting continued for some years as it is recorded by Alfred Wright, who visited some five or six years later. However when J.J. Neave visited again in 1880 the meeting seems to have ceased. Neave made an extensive visit to Friends in New Zealand and imitated Lindsay and Mackie in making an extensive, if not exhaustive, list of Friends in New Zealand. Unlike Lindsay and Mackie, Neave covered a much larger area of the country. Describing the many visits he made in the Province of Auckland, Neave was amazed at the strength of Friends' faith despite their isolation. It was not so evident in all cases, for, because of the isolation they experienced,

some joined other religions. This was illustrated by his visit to Anothony Jacobs and his wife who although members of the Society felt that due to their isolated position felt they should worship with others.[62] Yet even though they had joined another church in worship they still remained Friends.

Visiting isolated Friends was a very important aspect of Neave's mission. For many of these Friends he was the only solid contact they had with Friends since they had left England. Along with visiting these Friends Neave held the first meetings in Friends style that they had experienced since they had left England. Joesph Wilkins, his family and friends were among those to experience this sort of visit and received it with much appreciation.[63] An event that would no doubt have heartened Neave and hints at the strength of Friends despite their numbers is the recording of what was perhaps one of the first Quaker marriages in New Zealand:

> After this [dinner] W.B. Farrand joined us, and we settled down into a religious meeting, in which G. and M.A. told us what they had that morning done, and promised through Divine assistance to be unto each other loving and faithful helpmates until it should please the Lord by death to part them.[64]

It is clear that despite their smallness and sense of isolation they were determined to keep up the practices they knew so well. Neave was for the most part an integral part of the calling of many of the meetings, but they were not always successful, for example the previous mentioned meetings of Ellen Fox.

When Alfred Wright and William Beck visited it was again the occasion for Ellen to try to organize a meeting and this

time her efforts met with more success. Although she tried to gather as many Friends as she could only eight attended,[65] but it would have been much appreciated by the isolated Friends. The meeting only lasted as long as the visiting Friend was in the region but in springing to life only briefly it demonstrates the willingness to meet wherever possible. Wright carried on the tradition of visiting Friends' meeting in local churches of other denominations and addressing them on Friends beliefs. These meetings also served the purpose, when advertised as a Friends meeting, of allowing Friends of the region to have contacts with Friends they did not know existed. Although not always the case on the East Coast of the North Island, it did serve the purpose of fulfilling a need these Friends would have felt keenly, to worship in their own way. These meetings also hastened the internal development of Friends as illustrated by the ill-fated Auckland Meeting.

As time went on and these small but significant developments began to take place it becomes noticeable that London Yearly Meeting, which was the governing body over New Zealand Friends, became more and more interested in the affairs of New Zealand. As the period of this chapter progresses, New Zealand is mentioned in the minutes and epistles with more frequency. The main area of concern for the Meeting was how they could be of service to the fledgling Society in New Zealand.

> The subject of addressing our friends in the Southern Hemisphere as referred to us by our Yearly Meeting has claimed our attention. We appoint the following Friends [not named] a Committee to bring in to a future meeting the draft of an Epistle

> to the Friends in the Southern Hemisphere leaving them liberty if they see their way to prepare two or more Epistles addressed to various meetings.[66]

This was the Epistle that J.J. Neave read to the meeting in Auckland, and, while not specifically mentioning New Zealand, it was only a short time till Friends addressed New Zealand specifically. This came about in 1871 when Joseph Crosfield a member of the Continental Committee wrote a letter which was no doubt on direction of the Yearly Meeting specifically to New Zealand Friends.[67] In this epistle there is mention of the first known example of an epistle from Auckland Friends.[68] This was to become a regular feature later but for Friends to have written one at this time is a major achievement.

This development was indeed a major leap for the scattered members of Auckland Province whether it be sent from Remuera or some other small gathering. In a later period Auckland would send these Epistles as the official commentator on events in New Zealand. This was done at a time when they were much stronger in numbers and in organization.That any of the small meetings of the time sent such an Epistle is a further example of internal development beyond the expectations of the facts. The letter of Crosfields also indicates further development of the meeting was occuring specifically the gathering together of Friends into some form of meeting.[69] The Continental Committee in sending out the seven epistles mentioned earlier marks the first real overseeing of New Zealand's affairs by the Yearly Meeting. To send seven Epistles to a country which had a small but growing population acknowledged that Friends' presence here was

important enough for them to take an ever growing interest and concern in them.[70] One reason for sending out so many Epistles was that the visits of Friends to New Zealand and letters from Friends here would have alerted them to the circumstances of Friends in the country. Further interest would have been fueled by Neave with his belief that despite Friends small numbers he predicted there would be meetings for worship in many places.[71]

An observation by the Deputation of Friends to Australia and New Zealand which visited New Zealand in 1874 hints that what Neave had commented upon was coming to pass. They remarked that while no meetings were held in public, Friends who were settled in some areas met in private in one anothers houses.[72] The deputation of 1874 led by Alfred Wright seems to have been a visit to check on the status of Friends in New Zealand and had come in response to observations that while Epistles were adequate there was a need to do something for Friends in New Zealand.

> The Committee [Meeting for Sufferings] have felt that it is one not adequately met an Epistle. They have felt the responsibility thus placed upon them, and have concluded to ask the Committee to allow a few Friends acquainted with the circumstances to lay the whole case before the Yearly Meeting, with the view of its endeavouring to ascertain whether the time were not come to send a deputation of two or three Friend to the colonies to extend (if may be) the help of which they stand so much in need, and for which they can only look to Yearly Meeting.[73]

This deputation was duly sent and notice that its mission was to help in any way it could. For Alfred Wright New Zealand, apart from Auckland, was a place to hurry through as quickly

as possible despite the intentions of their mission. With many of the places the deputation visited Wrights entries into his manuscripts read like a travelogue rather than a description of Friends and their needs. One such entry describes how they stayed only a brief time in Hokitika because of the residence there of only a few Friends.[74] However the primary reason for the brevity of each stop was that the deputation probably summed up the situation that the Friends were in and then gave help as it was needed.

This guideline was further seen in the visit they undertook in Christchurch.The visit was again brief but it was not without positive if short-lived results.

> We found but few Friends at Christchurch and therefore no necessity of our staying long. On First Day we held two meetings in the house of John Wilson which were attended by about a dozen of whom only two besides ourselves were Friends. They decided to continue the meeting regularly in the same place once a week, and having encouraged them to make this effort we felt to have done all that lay in our power and might pass on.[75]

The visits of Neave and the deputation of 1874 were very much voyages of discovery like the visit of Mackie and Lindsay in 1853. The deputation led by Wright differed slightly in its mission from that of Neave. Whereas it had been twenty years since the last visiting Friend and there was a need to find out how many Friends were in New Zealand the visit in 1874 had been charged with a definite mission. They were trying to help the Friends that were resident in New Zealand in any way possible. Themajor problem they encountered was of looking at New Zealand from an English point of view. This view was to become more prominent in later times and possibly proved a

hindrance to them giving much help to Friends in New Zealand. It meant the help they could give was limited. The visit of English Quakers usually coincided with the formation of meetings, for this is what practical help they thought they could best. What was needed were leaders as in most areas the Friends were willing to form a meeting but lacked someone who could form them into a meeting. A leader who would be based in New Zealand would have been the ideal situation and this would come about in the period covered in the next chapter but for now these English Friends filled in as substitutes.

These visiting Friends provided the impetus for meetings however short-lived to begin, for there was always a willingness among New Zealand Friends to come together. For many of them the memory of the meetings they had been used to in England was fresh and any chance they had of imitating these in New Zealand was welcome. The conditions in which this could happen were very different to those they had experienced in England and although the English Friends living in New Zealand had come from exactly the same background as the visiting Friends New Zealand Friends had adapted to the conditions they had found. For these visiting Friends these conditions must have seemed horrendous. Coming as they did from a country which had comfortable travelling conditions, built-up cities and was a well established country to one with its sparse settlements, impossible roads and sense of impermanence meant they more than likely viewed Friends' position as one of crisis. However as seen this was not entirely the case.

By 1880 therefore, while seemingly shaky and insecure, Friends were slowly but surely gaining a foothold in New Zealand. Their ability to adapt to the new situation in which they found themselves meant that, while not looking particularly strong the Society was on a solid foundation. The small groups which had formed but unfortunately not continued were the precursors of one united meeting which would be founded in Auckland during the next period. For other areas of the country circumstances were not to improve in any major way, especially for places such as the East Coast of the North Island. Yet in their own way as Mason in Wellington had done these Friends, mentioned above,were bastions of the Society. They exhibited this through their continuing membership of the Society despite their isolation. The Society was still in its formative period, and still needed all the help which could be given by the Society in England, mostly visits by Friends who sought to help in any practical way possible.

Another area which points to the growing development in the Society was the interest in events expressed by the English Society. This interest, in fact, signals an ever increasing involvement of the English Society in events in New Zealand. It was in no way as explained, to be thought of as an attempt to influence or direct the Society; it was merely that they were attempting in any way possible to help the Society. One interest was in building up the growing number of Friends in Auckland where the Yearly Meeting must have felt any long term development was likely to take place. It was certain that immigrant numbers would increase, but what was needed was the

arrival of someone who would be permanently based in New Zealand and would be able to give firm leadership while things were put on a firm and long term foothold. In 1879 Ann Fletcher Jackson arrived and was to be a dominating influence on nearly the whole of the next twenty years (to be discussed in the next chapter). This domination by Jackson would be totally unexpected for, as her son Fletcher Jackson described, his mother did not have a clear idea of what she could do in New Zealand.[76]

Ann's plans may have been unclear when she arrived but the family immediately started to make an impact. The Sunday after Ann and her family arrived a meeting was started on the same lines as the ones they had attended in England.[77] Her arrival in New Zealand signalled the beginnings of permanent foundation of the Society in New Zealand. Before this there were signs of this happening but it was still in a precarious position. Her work as an itinerant minister which will be described in the next chapter, was a major factor in this. If her reasons for immigrating to New Zealand were unclear then the same was true of her early ministry to Friends.[78] Ann had some idea of what this might be but could have had no inkling that this would involve almost twenty years of ceaseless visits to Friends over the whole of New Zealand and even to Australia. With the arrival of Ann Jackson the Society began a sustained period of development which had been begun in the Auckland attempts to establish a meeting and in the stalwart individuals who had adapted well to the circumstances in which they found themselves.

ENDNOTES

1 Statistics of New Zealand for 1861, including the results of a Census of the Colony taken on 16th December in that year

2 Statistics of New Zealand for 1864 including the results of a Census of the Colony taken in December of that year

3 Results of a census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 27th of February 1871

4 Census 1871 Op.cit.

5 Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 18th of March 1874

6 Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of the 3rd of March 1878

7 Hill M. Do Sects Thrive while Churches Languish In Religion in New Zealand Society ed. by Colless B. & Donovan P. p.116-117

8 West M. and Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972 p.2

9 West and Fawell Op.cit.

10 Continental Cttee. MS Minutes(1868-1884) MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library (hereafter ATL)

11 Tasmania Yearly Meeting 1864 appendix p.9

12 Ibid p.10 13 Ibid. p.11 14 Ibid. p.12 15 Ibid. p.13

16 Meeting for Sufferings MS Minutes Vol.46 p.387 MS Micro 647 ATL

17 Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 27th of February 1871

18 Abridgement of Pudney R.H.E. 'A Quaker Chronicle' File 33/8/2 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.2

19 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1871 MS Micro 647 ATL p.71

20 Ibid. p.72 21 Yearly Meeting Op.cit. 22 Ibid. p.73

23 A.Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.1 MS Micro 647 ATL p.110

24 Pudney, 'A Quaker Chronicle' ATL p.22 25 Ibid p.2

26 Neave Joesph James Leaves from the Journal of (ed.) with notes by Joesph J. Green ATL p.226

27 Ibid. p.227 28 Neave Op.cit.

29 Pudney, 'A Quaker Chronicle' ATL p.3

30 A. Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.1 ATL p.114

31 Ibid. p.114-5

32 Neave Leaves from Journal ATL p.228

33 Jackson F. Past History of Friends in New Zealand File 33/8/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.25-6

34 Ibid. p.26

35 Fox E. Letters of Ellen Fox from Thames, New Zealand 1869-76 Jan 16 1870 File 33/3/5 MS Papers 2597 ATL

36 Fox, Letters Op.cit.

37 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.29

38 Continental Cttee MS Minutes (1868-1884) ATL

39 Sharp I. MS Diaries Vol.37 MS Micro 647 ATL p.5

40 A.Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.3 ATL p.66

41 West and Fawell, Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.17

42 Seventy-Fourth Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages in England and Wales 1911, p.xli quoted In Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p.172

43 Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p.172 44 Ibid. p.173

45 Isichei Op.cit.

46 Neave Leaves from Journal ATL p.225

47 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.24

48 Jackson Op.cit. 49 Ibid. p.25

50 Graham J. 'Settler Society' In Oliver W.H. and Williams B.R.(eds.) The Oxford History of New Zealand p.113

51 Graham Op.cit.

52 The settlement of Albertland was the brainchild of one William Rawson Brame, who in the early 1860's dreamed of a non-conformist settlement to the north of Auckland encompassing the present site of Rodney and Otamatea counties. It was intended as a rememberance of the 200th anniversary of the expulsion of dissident ministers

from the Church of England.

53 Borrows J.L. Albertland The Last organized British Settlement in New Zealand p.63

54 Borrows Op.cit.

55 A. Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.1 ATL p.115

56 Graham, Settler Society p.113

57 Graham, Settler Society p.128

58 Graham, Settler Society p.127

59 A. Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.1 ATL p.111

60 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1871 ATL p.72

61 Yearly Meeting Minutes Op.cit.

62 Neave Leaves from Journal ATL p.200 63 Ibid. p.198

64 Ibid. p.207

65 Fox, Letters of Ellen Fox July 1875 ATL p.2

66 Mtg. for Sufferings MS Minutes Vol.47 ATL p.321

67 Joesph Crosfield to New Zealand Friends 1871 MS Box 27/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

68 Crosfield Op.cit. 69 Crosfield Op.cit.

70 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1874 ATL p.20-1

71 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1871 ATL p.73

72 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1876 ATL p.12

73 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1874 ATL p.21

74 A. Wright, Stones of Memorial Vol.1 ATL p.102

75 Ibid. p.110

76 Jackson, Past History of Friends ATL p.30

77 Jackson Op.cit. 78 Jackson Op.cit.

CHAPTER THREE

CONSOLIDATION AND GROWTH: THE YEARS OF ANN FLETCHER JACKSON 1880-1900

If any one person can claim to have strode like a colossus across the history of Friends in New Zealand that person must surely be Ann Fletcher Jackson. Arriving with her family in 1879 as described, for the next twenty-four years until her death in 1903, Ann Jackson was to dominate Friends history. The numerous visits which Ann Jackson made up and down the country to minister to isolated Friends were an important factor in keeping Quakerism alive in these places. Ann Jackson was a mother figure to the fledgling Quarterly meeting and it was her dynamic personality which, despite the hardship she and her family experienced and her own advancing age, helped to consolidate the position of Friends once they began to organize. During the period under study in which she lived and worked, the Society made prodigious gains in development and through this consolidated its position in three of the main centres and in small structural gains. It was during this time that the first permanent meeting in Auckland was started, in 1885. From the small beginning in that year came a concern with wider activities as Friends moved from internal development to become involved in the outside world. There was a growing outspokeness in peace issues and with the development of the Auckland Meeting there

were the beginnings of involvement in Adult Education. While the Auckland meeting is the most prominent in its development there were parallel developments which were just as great in their own ways in other centres. By the end of the period under discussion the Society of Friends was on a strong footing.

Born in 1833 Ann Fletcher was of Quaker parentage and upbringing and in 1859 she married Thomas Jackson. Early in her life a ministering Friend who visited the Fletcher home said to the young Ann: "I hope dear thou wilt be faithful to the call of the Lord, for I believe He will call thee to special service for Him, to preach the Gospel in distant places and be a comfort to many far and near; only be faithful."[1] This was remembered by Ann and in 1878 she and her family set off to New Zealand leaving her friends with the belief that she and her family had not chosen the path they were taking but that it had been chosen by God.[2] This belief that the inner spirit was not limited to men alone allowed such women as Ann Jackson to develop in ways they would not have been able to in other denominations during this time, where it has been said that women must 'ever bear the reproach' for Eve's transgression in Eden.[3] Fox did not deny the historicity of this but argued that this reproach had been taken away by Mary. From Mary came the idea that men and women were equally able to preach. This meant that on the spiritual side of Quaker life, there has never been any occassion for a struggle by Quaker women' to demand a 'right' from the men.[4] At this point however a dichotomy appears which was not

resolved until about the time that Ann and her family arrived in New Zealand and she began her ministry. While Fox believed in the equality of men and women with regard to spirituality, it was not the same when it came to matters of business.

Instead of one meeting for business Fox advocated and indeed set up separate women's meetings along similar lines to that of the men's. 'With his knowledge and experience of the work both spiritual and practical' and the ideas of women such as Margaret Fell and many others,[5] Fox set forth his ideas of setting up separate meetings. He wrote frequently over the years concerning the womens' meetings, using the expression 'helpsmeet for men' to describe women's role. These women's meetings were to use and develop women's special gifts and to this end they visited and relieved the poor and needy. Fox's relentless advocacy of the separate women's meetings was maintained against stubborn opposition within the Society for more than ten years, and was the cause of much bitterness.[6] Many felt that since men and women were equal there was no reason why they should not meet together, as they did in London at the Six Month's Meeting, conservatives, claimed that while men and women met together the women should not take part in discussions. By the beginning of the eighteenth century Quaker women did not enjoy equal status in the business meetings with the men.

However, the opportunities open to women in Quakerism were still large compared to their restricted role in other religious organizations in Victorian England,[7] and by the time Ann Jackson began to preach and take a strong role in the

business meeting in Auckland a change had occured. While outwardly women had seemed the equal of men it was only through certain offices, the most important of these being that of minister. It was not until 1896 that the Men's Yearly Meeting decided that women formed an integral part of Quaker organization, and they decided to allow women to sit communally and to debate in Yearly Meeting. While this decision took a long time to implement, the fact remains that it is difficult to imagine any other Victorian context, whether it be English or in New Zealand, in which women could have flourished.[8] It is this tradition that Ann Jackson followed but she also accelerated it, for while the decisionto allow women to take part in business meetings was made in 1896, Ann Jackson and other women were participating much earlier.

Upon the Jacksons' arrival in New Zealand a little Meeting for Worship on First-Day morning was started at their house at Otonga, north of Auckland. To this meeting all her neighbours were welcome, and, as was to be a feature of her work, these were usually well attended with many coming considerable distances on horseback to attend. In 1885 she made her first journey to minister to Friends elsewhere when she undertook a trip to Auckland which occupied three weeks. It was while Ann was in Auckland that, along with Rufus P. King and his companion and twenty-four others, the decision was made to hold a regular meeting on First-days but more importantly to establish a Meeting for Church Affairs (Discipline) once in three months. Like the meetings that have been described started in the previous chapter this meeting

had no official standing. However unlike these it was the beginning of a long and fruitful meeting.

In 1886 she undertook a visit which was to be a feature of her work, a journey through both the North and the South Islands. The importance of this and other work that she was involved in can be shown in a pamphlet issued in 1888 which reported that it was largely due to Thomas and Ann Jackson that a few Friends had 'met for public worship' on First-day mornings in Auckland.[9] (At this time the Jackson family lived a considerable distance from Auckland, where they regularly travelled to attend this weekly meeting). Her response sheds light on both the travel that had to be done to get anywhere in New Zealand, and her determination.

> Friends live at such great distances apart that a good deal of time will be spent in getting from one place to another, and we do not wish to miss one who bears the name of Friend. The difficulties of getting about in this country are much greater than they are at home. We cannot get to some places overland, but have to go by steamers from one part to another.[10]

With such dedication to her work throughout the whole of the country it was no wonder that the 1888 pamphlet made the comments it did and her opinions on such matters as the meeting-house when it was discussed would have been very influential. Her visits throughout New Zealand served a similar purpose to that of English Friends except that hers were more frequent and seem to have been more beneficial.

When Ann and her husband were contemplating moving nearer to Auckland, it was considered by Friends in New Zealand, and those who visited from England, as an important step in the

development of the Society. It was hoped that by this move 'the position of Friends would be different' and that the Meeting would become a Meeting for Discipline.[11] Countless references to her visits in the Yearly Meeting Minutes show that the Yearly Meeting was grateful that Ann and her husband visited so many isolated Friends, even if it was a difficult task. The 'shepherding of the flock' that they hoped would bear fruit,[12] did so many years later. For many Friends, apart from the occasional visit by English Friends, Ann and her husband were the only link they in their isolation had. In her many visits she reached, at one time or another, all Friends who resided in New Zealand. These visits were warmly appreciated and proved vital in retaining the membership of these distant Friends. Though they still retained their English membership it was very easy for them to drift apart from the Society, something which no doubt many did, but Ann Jackson's visits meant fewer were lost than could have been. It was through these visits she gained an insight into the hardships that others shared with her family and gained the 'power to understand and sympathise with those she had thus visited in newly settled lands'[13], it was this that would distinguish her from the visits of later English Friends.

When it was confirmed in 1890 that the Jacksons were to move nearer Auckland, the reaction of Auckland Friends was immediate and enthusiastic. It was a great gain for Auckland Friends when Ann and her husband moved to a comparatively short distance from Auckland. Having been 100 miles away this meant that they poured even more energy into building up the

other Friends and the Society as a whole.[14] Once they did move nearer Auckland in 1893 Ann Jackson's work seemed to increase. In all seasons Ann would drive into town on Sunday and spend every Wednesday 'visiting Friends and attending Bible Class.' She also started a First Day school in her home but when this became to large she had a hall built with assistance from Friends in New Zealand and in England.[15] Her son Fletcher described her as a women who had no clear idea of what service was required of her but the step they had taken(this being the decision to immigrate) had been the right one and a reason would be revealed.[16]

Ann Jackson was a link between Friends in New Zealand and England. While living in New Zealand, even after Auckland was constituted a Meeting for Discipline, she still kept her membership up with her meeting in England. At the same time she was firmly attached to New Zealand and unlike the visiting English Friends was a permanent resident in New Zealand. This meant that her visits were far more regular and could be far longer than any of the English visits were. She was also able to maintain internal links with the growing number of meetings which were established elsewhere in New Zealand. With the move to Avondale in 1893 the Jacksons consistently, 'week by week', for seven years, with only one break, attended the meeting.[17] Such devotion to the meeting was a great boost to it and New Zealand Friends had what they had previously been lacking, a leader.

In terms of major growth and development this period from 1880-1900 is the one most important in Friends' history. In

1885 the Auckland Meeting, which had been defunct for approximately ten years had suddenly come to life again in a more stable form and in 1890 it acquired the first of two meeting houses. In the towns of Dunedin and Christchurch small meetings in private dwellings were organized and for a short while Colyton, near Fielding, became the centre for a number of Friends in that district. As the meeting in Auckland developed further, Friends took up their association with Adult Schools and to illustrate how far they had grown the end of this period brings the first formal pronouncements of Friends' peace principles. These came not from visiting English Friends but from Friends in New Zealand. Also during this time came a growing closeness between the two countries as Quakerism continued to grow and consequently the practical assistance given by the English Society increased.

The year 1885 is marked by a 'revival in interest' among Friends in Auckland. This was due in part, said the Yearly Meeting minutes,[18] to the presence of Rufus P. King. It was he was in Auckland that Friends had gathered together for meeting for worship. It may be reasonable to assume that this meeting would have about as much success as that which had been attempted fifteen years before. This time however arrangements were made for a meeting to be held every three months and from that time on Friends met for worship every First day.[19] The main reason why this meeting succeeded where others had failed was that while Friends in the Auckland Province were still widely scattered, there were a number of them in close proximity to Auckland and to each other. This

ensured there were sufficient numbers to maintain continuity. At last through this meeting Friends were beginning to establish and consolidate themselves and fulfill the prophecy of J.J. Neave fifteen years previously. "I think meetings for worship will be ultimately settled in several places but as yet are few and feeble."[20] In one area Friends could be said to be feeble and that was in numbers. Yet they seemed not to have been unduly bothered by this and with the few (compared to most other denominations) they proceeded to go about organizing themselves.

With regards to this organization the question of the part played by Rufus King bears close scrutiny, although there are conflicting opinions about the part King and his companion played. Rufus King was a powerful preacher and this could have been a focus for the gathering and an impetus for the decisions made at this said meeting.[21] It may be that King did in fact have a major part to play in the setting up of the meeting. Yet Fletcher Jackson describes a man who was rather depressed and had no definite idea of the services required of him.[22] The larger question to be answered is whether King had any influence on the meeting and its outcome. The degree which King played a role in the outcome of the meeting can be understood when one examines the role of Ann Jackson and her husband in its foundation. It had been the hope of Ann and her husband to start a meeting such as this one ever since their arrival in New Zealand. In 1885 they had advertised and visited many Friends to solicit help in starting such a meeting. At last they had succeded in their quest and the

meeting which King attended was the result.[23] King therefore may have been in Auckland at the time of the meeting but the decisions it came to regarding meetings for discipline and worship were due largly to the groundwork done by Ann and her husband. It was Ann who also carried on the work of continuing to build up the meeting after King left.

> Ann Jackson was faithful in attendance at Quarterly Meetings, as the Meetings for business were called, effectively ensuring that all business was properly attended to, but Friends resident in Auckland found themselves well able to carry on the weekly Meeting for Worship, once someone with the power of leadership had given the push necessary to start them off. Hitherto Quaker groups had lacked numbers, continuity and leadership. At a time when Auckland had sufficient members who were settled in their residence, there, a Friend capable of giving the required leadership appeared.[24]

This work extended to visiting those Friends who could not reach any sort of meeting that was organized by Friends. The evidence suggests that even if these Friends could not attend such meetings they carried on their faith in any way that they could. This usually meant that if they could not travel great distances they did at certain times have their own private silent meetings.[25]

Dunedin, which I will speak of in detail later, was a perfect example of the above. From 1888 there was a meeting in the home of William and Mary Harlock. In the beginning it consisted of only the Harlock family but it was more importantly a meeting which began with no outside help. The conclusion which can be reached is that instead of seeing the English Society as trying to impose its influence on New Zealand Friends it was in fact content to let the Society in

New Zealand develop along its own lines, encouraging and helping it as appropriate.

> There is an earnestness of spirit about some of the Friends in this newly gathering little church, and the Continental Committee has endeavoured as in the case of those in Queensland, to promote and encourage these efforts at organization, trusting for their growth into a stage for being recognized as a distinct Meeting for Discipline.[26]

The most practical means for them to help was in transporting Friends to the newly formed meeting. The expense involved was greater than individual Friends or any meeting could meet and assistance the Yearly Meeting offered would have been most welcome.[27]

Along with the above expense there was also a call for financial help with regards to the rent and furnishing the room where they meet. London Yearly Meeting was happy once again to oblige.[28] These financial burdens were ones which the fledgling meeting could not hope to take on and thus the help given by the Yearly Meeting in the way described was not an attempt to influence but merely a jesture of help, till Auckland Meeting gained strength. One example was the meeting house, an idea first mooted in 1888. The desire to gain a permanent base was strong and to this end Friends appointed a committee to consider the subject. At this early stage the desire to help New Zealand Friends to achieve such a goal can be seen in that several sums had already been promised from both English and New Zealand Friends.[29] The step taken to appoint a committee shows that the internal development of Friends had progressed, probably because of a regular meeting. The wish to become a more visible presence in the wider

community also indicates that Friends hoped to develop externally as well as internally and this could only be accomplished by a meeting house where they could draw people to these other activities. The number of people belonging to the Society had on paper increased to a number higher than that of 170[30] (between 282[31] and 315[32] according to census figures) and with it came the desire to branch out into other activities.

The outpouring of funds was an attempt by the English Society to give the Society in New Zealand every possible chance of succeeding where earlier efforts had failed. It was, in a sense, a last effort to establish the Society in New Zealand but that the aid was not used to manipulate the Society into any position. All aid was gratefully accepted especially with regards to the Meeting house. When they heard of the desire to build a meeting house the Yearly Meeting encouraged Friends in Britain to contribute towards it and empowered the Meeting for Sufferings if it found it desirable to give two hundred pounds toward it.[33] This meeting house, unlike the one in Nelson, which fell into disuse and was subsequently sold, was with a change of address, to became a permanent fixture in Auckland. With this permanency came a desire to move outward. It is important to realise that although it was financed largely by English Friends the move to have it built was a decision taken solely by the Auckland Meeting. The desire to have it built was the results of internal developments by Friends. Yet despite these developments in both internal and external areas there was

still a great deal of work to do. One area was that of membership acceptance. When Thomas Mason requested to join the meeting the Auckland Meeting had to decline because it did not have the power to accept certificates of removal[34] which were the means by which Friends transferred from one meeting to another.

Once Auckland began its Meeting for Discipline there was pressure from outside to have it constituted as a recognized Meeting for Discipline with the power to accept members and responsibility for the rest of New Zealand. Adelaide Meeting had suggested to the Meeting for Sufferings in 1895 this exact proposal but it was rejected. Auckland was in no position to oversee members who were scattered over many miles and in many districts,[35] and both Meetings recognized that Auckland neither had the numbers nor the strength to handle such matters. However this suggestion foreshadows events described at the end of this chapter and the beginning of the next. Five years later the Meeting was able to make such a move. The Meeting for Sufferings on receiving the above minute summed up the position quite well. "As no proposal has been received from Auckland on the subject, this meeting does not see its way to take action at present, but the Continental Committee is asked to watch for an opening on the subject."[36]

The opening of the meeting house was instrumental in hastening the development of Friends into different areas, all of which were familiar to them from the days when they resided in England. Way opened, as is the expression among Friends, for them to move into establishing an adult school in

Auckland. After the visit of William J. Sayce in 1891 a small Adult School was opened which seemed to begin on a firm foundation.[37] While many Friends in Auckland would remember adult school from their days in England the tradition of Friends involvement in adult education was not a very long one. Friends in England began their involvement in this movement in 1842 when it was known as First-Day School. Friends were in fact late comers to the adult school movement in part through a mixture of 'snobbery and sheer inertia'.[38] From the beginning much Quaker opposition stemmed around the tradition of quietism. Those who were quietists saw a denial 'of the very spirit of Quakerism' in giving consistent Sunday instruction without claiming special inspiration.[39] The early Quaker advocates of Sunday School were without exception evangelicals. While the same cannot be positively said of the adult School started in Auckland, notice should be taken that Ann Jackson was a particular driving force and was devoted to the school's success. She would drive into town no matter what the season in time for the adult school.[40] In time her connection with the school increased, so much so that she invited those who attended to the farm at Avondale.[41]

The differing outlooks on education of these two groups within Quakerism was not the only problem which affected this desire to start an adult school in England. When other denominations in England started adult schools, it was hoped that theirs would expand numbers if the scholars became church members. However Friends had an ambivalent attitude to converts in general, and working-class converts in particular.

This presented a peculiar problem. Should they teach their pupils any specific Quaker beliefs such as those on pacifi sm?[42] The evangelical attitude of simply teaching a core of their religion without the tenets enraged many and the dilemma of this problem wrecked a strongly supported proposal to establish a First-day school in Manchester in 1842. However once schools were established a compromise was reached. With families attending, the Quaker tradition of silent worship proved impractical especially with restless children unused to Quakerism. The compromise to this was to introduce hymn singing in the service which of course horrified traditionalists. This happened wherever a First-day school was established, and in most cases conservative Friends who took great offence at their introduction threatened to withdraw the use of the Meeting House.

The great motivation which Friends in New Zealand may have shared with Victorian English Quakers was the distress at the irreligion of the poor, made painfully evident by the 1851 religious census, and by the strong, if narrowly focused desire to help the poor improve their material condition. The English Quakers were also influenced by the success of other denominations[43] in this area and by a vague and unformulated feeling of duty. They believed that one solution to poverty was in the triumph of the individual over his or her circumstances.[44] The writings of the movement's leaders, such as William White and Edward Smith are full of stories of scholars who have reached the plateau of respectibility through the exercise of the bourgeois virtues of sobriety,

thrift and self-improvement.

While the New Zealand Adult Schools were begun on the English model, they were in no way carbon copies of them. The meetings which sprang up around the adult school bear some resemblance to the ones described above but differed in that they were not part of the actual Meeting. When some of the adult school scholars wanted to give 'practical proof' of what they had received from attandance at the school, a meeting was set up especially for them. It was named the 'Christian Endeavour Band' after the Endeavour Societies on which it was based.[45] This had grown out of the suggestion of a Friend, John Rigg, in 1891. He had suggested that it was Friends duty to commence an adult school, probably to replace that which had been started earlier.[46]

The growth from this school to the meeting indicates a measure of success in the venture and numbers attending the school grew in time. With this growth in numbers came an additional problem, one which they again inherited from English Friends. The problem concerned the relationship of schools to Quakerism[47]. The members, of what was in England a predominantly middle-class denomination, could not contemplate the prospect of large numbers of working-class converts with equanimity, especially since they considered themselves bound to contribute to the support of their poorer members, and subsidise their children's education. The problem was that the aim of the schools was to turn 'scholars into ardent Christians', and that Christianity was regarded as inseparable from some church membership. The Quaker teacher he could not

encourage scholars to join another church, but they did not want to see them join no church at all.[48]

Some of the Adult Scholars in England did become members and although they formed an important proportion of all converts, they were only a tiny fraction of those who came to Quakerism. Many however had no desire to become Quakers, some were discouraged by the informal barriers which existed. A scholar visiting a meeting often discovered that there was a difference between the 'cheerful bonhomie of the schools' and the exclusiveness of the meeting house.[49] In the end only a minority would have been found Quaker worship appealing, so two alternatives existed. One was to join another denomination and the second was to regard the Adult School attendance as a form of membership. In New Zealand as has been shown a third possibility existed. As with English Meetings, it will probably never be known how many joined Friends in New Zealand Some of the Adult Scholars must have been among the attenders of the meeting and thus when (towards the end of the period) Auckland made decisions about its workings their opinions were sought. In 1895 this was recognized when a meeting of 'members and attenders' was formed as part of the step to being recognized as a Meeting for Discpline.[50] Under this guise, Auckland thus took care of both those who wished to join and those who simply wished to use the Adult School as a form of worship. This gathering of differs significantly from English Meetings who did not give consideration to these people, and shows a further development away from the English model of Adult Schools. The Adult School work continued to expand

despite these problems and in 1895 was reported as having an average attendance of 23.[51]

The other area which Friends moved into before the arrival of the meeting house was a first-day school for children. Education of their children was looked upon with great concern. In many cases Friends in New Zealand had been educated through the system of Friends boarding schools such as Ackworth and Penketh, which were subsidised by themselves. When they had children in the new land the situation was vastly changed. Until the school at Wanganui was opened in 1920 there were no educational institutions similiar to those they had known. Thomas Mason noticed this and its consequences as far back as 1851.

> The result in all probability will be that all so educated will leave the Society. This is with reference to Van Dieman's land but in the other colonies there is a most marked and lamentable falling away, amongst the greater part there is not even the barest profession.[52]

A secular education could not transmit to the children the beliefs and principles of Friends. Therefore it was important that once some sort of organized meeting such as that described was begun, that Friends start a First-day school for their children. Ann Jackson was once again well to the fore in her role as a teacher of the children about their traditions.[53] The subject of the education of Friends' children will be discussed more fully in a later chapter.

In the same period during which these schools were being set up and run, two important events occured. In 1892 it became legal for Quakers to marry according to their custom.[54]

A Quaker marriage had been celebrated before this time, during the visit of J.J. Neave, but the move to legalise marriages according to their custom provides us with an insight into the internal development of Friends. The move to legality brings with it the wish to be perceived as an established and organized denomination rather than just another Christian sect. With the provisions of the act this was a step in this direction.

> The provision of the 'principal Act' (Marriage Act 1880) relating to the solemnisation of marriages in the presence of an officiating minister shall not extend to any marriage solemnised between parties one or both of who are members of, or in profession with, the religious Society of Friends, commonly called Quakers, but every such marriage shall be as legal and valid as if duly solemnised under the principal Act if such marriage was when celebrated, a valid marriage according to the usages of the Quakers.[55]

Once this legislation was enacted in 1897 it was not long before application to be married in the meeting house was received and was duly solemnized.[56] Coupled with this event is the appointment of firstly an Elder and later a Meeting of Ministry and Oversight. This occurred in 1893 when Thomas, Jackson was nominated and appointed to the position.[57] While the Eldership seems to have been more honorific than practical, in its own way it gave strength to the structure of the Meeting. The appointment was made because the meeting felt the time was right, and, at about the same time three overseers[58] were appointed. Overseers were the disciplinarians and detectives of the meeting and while they would not have had as many duties to perform as their English counterparts nevertheless they added weight to the question of applying for

recognition as a full Meeting for Discipline. While the question was under consideration they continued to hold 'Meetings for Church Affairs'[59] in which the overseers played an important part. This was the situation in 1894 and while numbers were still small Friends were beginning to build up strength and from this came organization.The application to become a recognized Meeting for Discipline was not to remain dormant for long. In the late 1890's the viability of an application grew with the increasing development in organization.

While Auckland proceeded to grow and develop in this manner it would be easy to forget that developments were occurring in other centres in New Zealand, notably Christchurch and Dunedin. Numbers here were small and confined to internal developments but the visits of Ann Jackson to Friends in these towns were a great source of help to these meetings in their beginnings. From these little meetings in later years would come events similar to those in Auckland. There was a great deal of energy in these new meetings and this was especially evident in Friends in Dunedin. If anyone can claim the title of founders of the meeting it is certainly William and Mary Harlock who came to Dunedin in 1880. When they left England it was a 'serious undertaking'. They were after all coming to a country where the Society had no foundation in either organization or meetings for worship.[60] Despite these handicaps the persistence of an individual again breaks through this barrier to continue to practice their faith.

> Owing to M. Harlock's strong belief in the principles of Friends, she could not feel comfortable in attending other places of worship, so it was arranged to hold a meeting every First Day evening. Since 1886, a meeting has been regularly held on First Day morning, which has proved of much blessing.[61]

Dunedin had such a small population of Friends that it is hard to forsee that they would develop into an organized meeting by 1920, but this was the case. From humble beginnings the meeting grew into that which will be discussed later in the thesis. When Ann Jackson visited in 1888 she found the Harlock family holding a meeting among themselves on a regular basis.[62] The meeting grew with the arrival of another family who joined them in the Meeting for Worship.[63] By 1893 due to the continuing influx of new members a primitive structure in the meeting begun to take shape.

> Although I am clerk to the meeting what I may say must not be taken as official information...When W.J. Sayce was here he encouraged us to begin an Adult school. It did not succeed but from the attempt a Bible class came into existence. From this class we started, what we called a Quarterly Meeting for want of a better name.[64]

The name was the only thing that it had in common with the Auckland or English understanding of the concept and in reality it was merely a time of social intercourse for Friends in Dunedin. Yet to dismiss its importance would be wrong, for the Quarterly Meeting was a great success in this form and served a real need. The meeting became of such interest that there frequency was increased to that of two months. When it was suggested that they be held monthly this was declined for fear of the numbers waning if this occurred.[65]

Despite these small but important developments, Dunedin

was still too small and fragile for any major developments to occur. The Meeting for Worship was well attended but when asked why no meeting house was built the problems that were discussed in chapter two relating to these small meetings and changing populations were revealed once again. Of the Harlock family, two of John's brothers had left as had his sister who had only recently returned.[66] Despite these obstacles, Dunedin was beginning to develop. In 1893 Auckland Quarterly Meeting records that they had received an Epistle from Dunedin, which is not the gesture of a short-lived meeting.

If Dunedin was slow, then Christchurch showed hardly any development at all during this period. Although a Meeting for Worship seems to have been started it was a very on/off affair and for short periods of time any meeting however organized was non-existent. "Ann F. Jackson on visiting Christchurch found the meeting amongst a few Friends there had become discontinued, and some that were in membership of the Society had drifted quite away from it."[67] This was in 1888 but to show the nature of the meeting four years later London Yearly Meeting reported that a Meeting for Worship in Christchurch had welcomed Alfred Wright[68]. The meeting seems to have been shared amongst various Friends' houses but finally settled on Henry J. Wardell's house. Not much further can be found about the meeting, suffice to say that it appears from the mid-1890's to have met on a regular basis for Worship. A small meeting such as this was a prime target for J.J. Harlock's observations on the shifting population but what they lacked

in numbers they made up for with a core group.

A further example of how population shifts can affect a meeting is provided by Colyton, which is near Fielding. For a meeting to stay together the numbers must stay consistent. "But, by a combination of circumstances, Colyton, a farming district near Palmerston North, became an active centre for the Society of Friends for about ten years from 1892."[69]

When Robert L. Pudney a graduate of the Royal Agricultural College married and settled in Colyton, during the thirteen years that he and his family remained in the area they attracted a number of Friends families to the district. Eleven years earlier there had been an attempt to establish some sort of meeting in Colyton but without much success. Once it became apparent that the meeting was going to be established in some form it is noticeable how quick attention was given to it. Each year it was included among the names of meetings of Friends which were active in New Zealand.[70] Despite this start and the subequent years, once the leaders of the meeting left, the Pudneys, the meeting quickly fell apart. For small meetings such as these the intentions of London Yearly Meeting seems to have been to see how well the meeting began and once this was accomplished to speed development as fast as possible. With regard to the Australian Finance Fund, the Yearly Meeting shows conclusively that while they were interested in helping Australian and New Zealand Meetings, they nevertheless allowed development to happen in its own time and way. "There are many ways in which a fund of this kind can be used in their unendowed meetings without

the least interfering with the 'Independence of Friends' which is so highly prized by them and the Committee."[71] Although written outside the time under discussion this does nevertheless further indicate the attitude which English Friends took when aiding the Meetings of far-flung Friends.

Once again there were several visits by Friends to New Zealand, primarily to to help the Friends here in any way possible. Some of their activites have been discussed, but the most noteworthy observation to make here of some of the visitors is the way that a distinctive English perspective on New Zealand begins to take shape. While fully supportive and willing to do anything which would help Friends develop, they viewed certain events through this peculiar filter. An example of this is the events leading up to the building of the Meeting house.

> They find it difficult to get a good site at a moderate price - but it does seem a pity to choose an out of the way corner to build upon where they could not so easily have a 'public' meeting, or do mission work if they wished - so they are looking for a better one.[72]

Whether this site was any better than the one that was in the end selected is not known, but the attitude seen here was to develop more fully later (see next chapter), as visiting Friends extended their time in New Zealand to more than just a few months. Another part of these Friends' mission seems to have been to promote activities that they felt Friends should be moving into. This can be seen in the adult school begun after William Sayce's visit in 1892. With many of these endeavours, the visitors promoted them but the impetus for

their actual implementation was often provided by local Friends. In the case of the Adult School this came from John Rigg[73] who brought it to the meeting in the same year as Sayces' visit. The aim of these visits was to bolster what they saw as an ailing Society, but this was not always the case and in most things to do with the Society, Friends in New Zealand had more than enough knowledge of their own situation to make the neccessary decision.

The New Zealand Society, with which Auckland and its meeting are at this time synonymous, were more than capable of making these decisions. This is well illustrated by calls for them to become a recognized Meeting for Discipline. Several times the call to do this had gone out but each time it had been rejected.

> We [Robert Harding, Thomas and Ann Jackson] had much conversation upon the 'Society' here and its interests to which they are so earnestly devoted. They fully unite with me in thinking that the time is not yet arrived for that 2 or 3 months meeting to be recognized as a Mtg. for Discipline with power to receive or otherwise members etc. and in this we find some others are agreed.[74]

With the development of the meeting and its external growth into other activities Friends in New Zealand began to take a firm hold on the decision making process based on what they knew and understood the circumstances of their meeting was. Development took place as they saw fit and while the need for finance and some decisions from the English Society were still neccessary, other links were becoming tenuous, as a Society with an identity of its own began to come into being. Auckland with its developing structure was the place many Friends in

New Zealand, especially the more isolated ones, looked to. With Ann Jackson increasingly taking over most of the duties of visiting Friends this link was cemented even further.

One area which seems to have developed in a spirit of co-operation is the move by Friends to plant firmly in the public's eye the peace principles they held. Thomas Mason (through his stand during the Land Wars) made Friends' views on war well known as did Frederick Tuckett in Nelson. These principles were frequently elucidated by various visiting Friends in public meetings that they organized in order to put forward not only their peace principles but Friends' principles in general. Such a meeting was held at the Y.M.C.A. in 1889.[75] This was not the only Peace Meeting they held and to have such an illustrious person as Sir George Grey attend meant that the move to make the public aware of their views was meeting with success. The real launching into the public eye of peace activities came in 1896 with two events, which reveal a further move to develop into the wider community instead of merely within the Society. When a Wesleyan Conference was held in Auckland, Friends addressed it on the issue of peace.[76] Secondly they sent a letter of protest to the Government over compulsory military drill, at the same time urging other denominations to do the same.[77] This desire for co-operation with other Christian groups foreshadows the co-operation which was to be shown in the First World War but more importantly the two instances show that even at this early period in their involvement they are willing to go to the highest authority.

The letter represents positive attempts to communicate what Friends stood for and is a clear enunciation of these principles. Further it is the first steps in a broader participation in Peace activities which deepens in the period covered in the next chapter and fully flowers in the last. The letter which was sent to the Premier and the Government represents a precise statement of Friends beliefs and outlines the stand which they later took on others behalf during World War One.

> This Meeting having felt it desirable to represent to the Government the injustice of an order lately made with regard to compulsory military training on the part of any who wish to enter the Civil Service. The folowing protest is to be forwarded to the Premier from this Meeting signed by the Clerk.
>
> > Memorial to the Honorable R.J. Seddon Premier and the Cabinet of the Colony of New Zealand From the Society of Friends in the District of Auckland.
>
> I, the undersigned on behalf of the Members of the Society of Friends in the district of Auckland respectfully memorialise.
>
> Tho' we have viewed with profound regret the efforts you are making to instill into the youth of the colony a love of Military pursuits - Especially do we refer to the order issued to those applying for posts in the Civil Service whereby a compulsory service of three years is required in a Volunteer Corps - we regard it as an interference with the rights of conscience practically excluding from the Civil Service all who deem war to be opposed to the principles of Christianity and an arbitrary interference out of accord with Civil and Religious liberty and would respectfully urge that said order may be recinded by you.
>
> Signed Robert S. West
> Clerk[78]

With these moves the Society in New Zealand began to even more firmly establish itself. It was standing on its own two

feet and had begun to further do so in this field when it sought to ally itself with other groups which had been set up for the furtherance of peace activities.[79] Once again it can be seen that Friends were willing to become more public in their protestations, and in 1899[80] when the Society, in combination with other groups, formed their Peace Society this was further evident.

One final piece to the jigsaw that reflects the growth and development which was achieved in this period comes in that same year.

> A communication having been received from Edwin R. Ransome suggesting that the time may be near at hand where it might be right for us to apply to the London Yearly Meeting to be recognized as a Monthly Meeting and this Meeting feeling the subject to be a very important one, and requiring more time than is now at our disposal, decides to adjourn this meeting to First-Day the 14th of 5th mon. next.[81]

It was indeed an important moment in the Society's history and while the initiative for this decision comes from Edwin Ransome (who for many years was a member of a committee that corresponded with Auckland Friends), Friends must have been seriously thinking this way themselves.

The application for such recognition is perhaps the most important in the growth and development of Friends. With it the concept of a separate and more independent Society in New Zealand comes a step closer to reality. The Society was still weak in numbers and the structure was not quite stable,but with this application and its confirmation (described in the next chapter) Auckland, in effect the Society of Friends in New Zealand at this time, became a fully fledged meeting.

Herewith is the complete document.

> To the Friends of the Continental Committee
>
> Dear Friends:-
>
> At various times during the 14 years since the establishment of the meeting of Friends at Auckland the question of the desirability of its being recognized as a Monthly Meeting possessing the usual powers and functions belonging to that position in the Society, has been considered but hitherto the decision arrived at has been, that the time had not yet come when such a step would be wise. At our last Quarterly Meeting however the matter was brought forward again, and after very serious and prayerful consideration it was decided to make application to the Yearly Meeting to be invested with the ordinary powers of a Monthly Meeting.
>
> For some years past the attendence at our Meeting on First-day morning has been very regular besides the frequent presence of strangers and occassional visitors. Some of the regular attenders have been enrolled as members of Auckland Quarterly Meeting, which under the present circumstances, is as much as we can do, and we now feel that the time has come when we should welcome them into the fuller privilage of being members of the Society of Friends. There are a number of Friends whose names do not appear below, and who live at too great a distance to attend at all regularly, but who take part in our Meeting whenever they have the opportunity, and who would no doubt be glad to have their certificates transferred to Auckland if there was a recognized Meeting.[82]

The application is a statement of the developments which will be examined in the next chapter but it also includes those which have already happened. The application brings this chapter to an end appropriately in the last year under study, and is the end result of the progress which had occured during this period. With the closing of the period the Society had become an established denomination in Auckland, it has small beginnings in two other centres and its numbers were growing. From small private meetings in houses the Society had now one Meeting with an organized structure and a Meeting House and

has launched itself into public affairs with its participation in peace activities. Once these had occurred it was only a matter of time until they applied for recognition as a Monthly Meeting. Any number of suggestions from England would not sway them. The most compelling reason why they applied for recognition when they did was their external development into public affairs. Once this happened, Friends attracted people and, as they told the Continental Committee these people were anxious to join but could only be enrolled until recognition came.

However the most important point is that with this application by Auckland, the Society in New Zealand takes on a new outlook. Before this the Society had been scattered individuals or groups which had met infrequently. Now this was no longer true. There was a focus for New Zealand in this Auckland Meeting and the flow on effects of this development are clear. Friends began to contribute to the philanthropic efforts of the English Society. Further, the ability to maintain stability in its own numbers and that of its ventures meant there continued success.[83] As Auckland developed a structure, the functions which they were able to perform grew. These functions were mostly those they had known in England, but adapted for New Zealand situations. All this may never have occurred, if it were not for the indomitable Ann Fletcher Jackson. While not single-handedly accomplishing many of the events described her strength and dedication were a significant factor in the Society' pace of growth and development. Once Auckland is in a healthy state, other areas

began their slow move from humble beginnings. By 1900 the Society was strong ready to begin a new century, one which would bring many ups and downs.

ENDNOTES

1 Lury S.J. Ann Fletcher Jackson Pioneer Resident Minister in the Society of Friends New Zealand p.9

2 Ibid. p.10

3 Lloyd A. Quaker Social History 1669-1738 p.109

4 Ross I. Margaret Fell Mother of Quakerism p.283

5 Ibid. p.284

6 Lloyd, Quaker Social History p.110

7 Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p.107

8 Ibid. p.109

9 Pamphlet: Friends in New Zealand dated 7th mon. 3rd 1888 MS Box 27/4 MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library (hereafter ATL)

10 Lury, Ann Fletcher Jackson p.17

11 Robert Harding to E.R. Ransome 7/7/90 MS Box 27/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

12 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1887 MS Micro 647 p.65 ATL

13 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1888 p.97 ATL

14 Samuel Morris to Edwin R. Ransome Auckland 1st Mon. 5th 1894 MS Box17/2 Micro MS 647 ATL

15 Lury, Ann Fletcher Jackson p.35

16 Jackson F. The Past History of Friends in New Zealand File 33/8/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.30

17 Ibid. p.38

18 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1886 p.56 ATL

19 Yearly Meeting Op.cit

20 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1871 p.73 ATL

21 West M. and Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972 p.8

22 Jackson, Past History of Friends p.33 ATL

23 West and Fawell, The Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.8

24 Ibid. p.8-9

25 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1886 p.56 ATL

26 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1887 p.65 ATL

27 Yearly Meeting Op.cit

28 Auckland Quarterly Meeting of Friends held 30th of 1st Month 1887 Min.7th

29 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 1st of 4th Month 1888 Min.6th

30 Pamphlet: Friends in New Zealand issued 7th of 3rd. Month 1888 ATL

31 Results of Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 28th of March 1886

32 Results of Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 5th of April 1891

33 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1888 p.25 ATL

34 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 7th of 4th Month 1889 Min.5

35 Continental Cttee MS Minutes (1891-1898) MS Micro 647 ATL p.99-100

36 Mtg. for Sufferings MS Minutes Vol.50 MS Micro 647 ATL p.603

37 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1892 p.91 ATL

38 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.261 39 Ibid p.259-60

40 Lury, Ann Fletcher Jackson p.35 41 Ibid. p.78-9

42 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.260 43 Ibid. p.265

44 Isichei Op.cit.

45 The Australian Friend Ninth Month 25th 1893 File 33/3/7 MS Papers 2597 ATL

46 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 12th of 7th mon. 1891 Min.7

47 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.274 48 Ibid. p.274-5

49 Ibid. p.275

50 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 14th of 7th Month 1895 Min.6

51 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1895 p.101 ATL

52 Mason, Papers Hutt 9th Month 1851 p.31 ATL

53 Lury, Ann Fletcher Jackson p.23

54 Jackson, Past History of Friends p.37 ATL

55 Marriage Act Amendment 1891 Section 4 New Zealand Law Statutes p.62

56 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 11th of 4th Month 1897 Min.9

57 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 8th of 10th Month 1893 Min.8

58 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1894 p.94 ATL

59 Yearly Meeting Op. cit.

60 Obituary Notice:-in The Australian Friend for Mary Harlock Ninth Month, 25th 1893 p.214 File 33/3/7 MS Papers 2597 ATL

61 Ibid p.215

62 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1888 p.97 ATL

63 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1890 p.65 ATL

64 J.J.Harlock to E.R.Ransome 25.1.93 MS Box 27/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

65 Harlock Op.cit. 66 Harlock Op.cit.

67 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1888 p.97 ATL

68 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1892 p.91 ATL

69 West and Fawell, Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.16

70 As in 1895 when they gathered for a Meeting for Worship

71 Statement Respecting the Present Position of the Yearly Meetings Australia Finance Funds. MS Box 27/3 MS Micro 647 ATL

72 Katherine Jones to Edwin Rountree March 31st 1889 MS Box 16/1 Library of the Society of Friends in London

73 Reported in Aucklands Quarterly Meeting held 12th of 7th Month 1891

74 Robert Harding to E.R.Ransome 8/7/1890 MS Box 27/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

75 Katherine Jones to Edwin R. Ransome Mar.31 1889 MS Box 16/1 Library of the Society of Friends, London

76 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1897 p.103 ATL

77 Yearly Meeting Op. cit.

78 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 12th of 7th Month 1896 Min.5 The Minute is reproduced fully as it is a perfect statement of Friends Peace principles.

79 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 9th of 10th Month 1898 Min.5

80 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 9th of 7th Month 1899 Min.8

81 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 9th of 4th Month 1899 Min.11

82 Auckland Quarterly Meeting 9th of 7th Month 1899 Min.10

As with the Peace protest the application is produced in full for the reason that it is one of the most important documents in Friends history

83 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1898 p.107 ATL

CHAPTER FOUR

A DECADE OF GROWTH OR A DECADE OF PROBLEMS 1900-1911

> Then the Meeting House is situated in a part of Auckland that has suffered much change of late years owing to the natural exodus to the new suburbs,and the immediate neighbourhood of the Meeting House is taken up by warehouses,(Hotels and the houses of those who have come down through drink or adversity).Near are larger homes, some of which are boarding houses and some the residences of better class people.But none of the classes represented here are likely ones for the building up of Friends Meeting.[1]

This quote from one of Edward Annett's letters to the committee with whom they corresponded, is one of many examples of what was briefly discussed in the last chapter, the English perspective on the New Zealand Society. However, it is particularly during the years 1900-1911 that the perspective begins to fully blossom. This will discussed with particular reference to the visit of two husband and wife teams during this period: Edward and Edith Annett who came to New Zealand in 1906-07 and Herbert and Mary Grace Corder who visited in 1911. Both visits, especially the Annetts, produced comments on the state of the Society in New Zealand which were full of dire warnings about how badly the Society in New Zealand was faring. Yet it was not just these visitors: the Yearly Meeting and its committees were not free from this biased view.

What was the reality of Friends' situation in New Zealand? On the one hand it was certainly experiencing some

difficulties. Yet the situation in reality was far more positive than as described from the English perspective. The first proof of this can be found early in the period of this chapter, with the application which Auckland Friends had sent to the Yearly Meeting to be recognized as a Meeting for Discipline, meaning that they were on the verge of being on a par with the Meetings in England. To view Friends in New Zealand as being in a bleak and gloomy position is also to ignore that in 1909 the first ever Conference of Friends was held in Wellington.

Census figures from this period certainly provide clear indication that the view of imminent collapse must be taken with a good deal of suspicion. From a very slight decrease in 1901, when Friends numbered 313[2], through a slight increase to 334[3], to a leap of 78 to 412[4] in 1910, the Society's numbers grew a great deal on paper at least. What these numbers mean is harder to explain. Auckland with the largest number of Friends in all three of the census would be the easiest to explain in terms of reality of numbers. In 1911 the census gave the total number of Friends there as being 192. However with the scattering of Friends which has been described in earlier chapters it is hard to see how this figure could have been a true reflection of Friends numbers. The same could be said of the other provinces. Wellington with 51 in 1906 does not compare with the reports of the numbers who attended the meetings. Again however, it is important to remember the geography of these areas, and the problems of transportation. So, while the numbers given may have been slightly higher than

the true figure, other factors were involved besides people putting down the religion of their parents and not being true Quakers.

With this growth in numbers came the development of new centres such as Wellington and in the other centres the meetings stabilized. In Auckland, despite the natural cycle taking place with the death of several leading members of the Meeting there was a growth in membership as applications were received from new people and English membership was transfered to the new Meeting. On the issue of peace, Friends began to voice their opposition to the policies of the government in a more public way. The final piece of evidence to be discussed in order to dispel the myth of a deep crisis is the year 1909, when the yearly gathering of Friends began.

At the close of the last chapter it was seen that Auckland Friends had in 1899 applied to the Continental Committee to become recognized as a Meeting for Discipline. While the Meeting for Sufferings had previously had recommended that Auckland become a Meeting for Discipline, curiously none had come from Auckland itself. Now however Auckland felt the time was right and the Meeting was happy to grant such a request.[5] It took perhaps less than six months for the appropriate procedure to take place. If there had been any doubts as to the viability of such a proposal then it would not have gone through. The confirmation of Auckland to this status gives us an insight into the reality of the situation of Auckland Friends at this time. They were in a position of strength, though one which would decline to a

as the decade went by. With this confirmation came the need for a number of changes to be initiated. These were looked into[6] and the neccessary decisions took place. The committee appointed reported that two changes were needed. One of these was to the name of the meeting. Secondly, and more importantly that the clerk of this new meeting was to correspond with the clerks of the Monthly Meetings of attenders at the Auckland Meeting with a view to receiving their certificates of membership.[7]

Before this, Friends who were members of an English Meeting had begun to send for their certificates of removal on their own accord, knowing that the application was likely to be approved. Alexander Russell and his family[8], Joesph and Ellen Vaughen[9], William Brown[10], George Frederick and Anne Marie Goldsbury and their family[11] all had their certificates presented at the same Meeting. Within the first year of the Meeting 33 members of overseas meetings presented certificates of removal. This represents a large response to the Meeting at a most awkward time while it was still feeling its way into new responsibilites. The ability to receive these people into membership is important. Friends were a non-proselytizing denomination. They did not actively seek membership and their only growth came from immigration of Friends. This new power meant that those who were not already Friends and attended regularly could now become members.[12] This process of transfer of membership from Britain and applications for membership from attenders of the meeting continued on throughout the first decade of the meetings existence and the minutes of the

meeting are filled with entries of both kinds. Auckland seems to have begun its new life strongly and to have carried it on, yet six years later visiting English Friends were crying doom.

A clue to the reason for the tendency for English Friends to see Friends in New Zealand in crises, is the death at around the same time of a number of elderly members, a natural phenomenon which occurs in all groups of a consistently small number. This tends to have a disrupting effect on any group and the effect of their death can often be exaggerated by members of the group themselves. A comparative situation occured with the dying of the first generations of Puritan ministers in the late 1600's after they had come to New England some 40 to 50 years earlier. Those who were left after these worthies had died commented that a pillar of the religion had gone and that the generations that were following would be the worse for it as they were not nearly as pious as the ones who had died, but in fact often the second and third generations were if anything more pious and fervent than the first arrivals. A similar phenomenon occurred just after the important event of the constituting of Auckland Meeting, with many of those who passed on having taken an active part in the sending of the application their death would have seemed a large blow. A death which falls into this category is that of Ann F. Jackson in 1903. Messages of sympathy poured into Auckland, and her death was seen as leaving a gap that would not easily be filled.[13]

The outstanding contribution made by Ann and her husband

meant a large gap was indeed left not just in Auckland Friends' lives but throughout New Zealand Quakerism. Many of her accomplishments were undertaken in a state of frail health and in unsettled districts. It was commented by many that she drew inspiration from 'Him who was her refuge and strength' in times of trouble.[14] Hers was not the only death to be felt in this way, a year or two later two more Friends, Alexander Russell and Robert West,[15] who had been long time members of the meeting passed on.

It was at this time that Friends began to ask for more help from theYearly Meeting, in the form of visits from English Friends. These requests came especially from the fledgling meetings in Wellington and Christchurch, but strangely not from Dunedin. The former two meetings were moving along slowly at a stop-start pace and felt the need for the prolonged visit of some ministering Friends to help promote these meetings. John Rigg was in London in 1904 to place the case of these various meetings before the various committees of the Yearly Meeting. [16] The hope of what the visit was to accomplish was at this time not connected with the idea of being a support for New Zealand Friends in a time of crisis. The question still remains, why did this perception spring up? In 1905, before the Annetts set out for New Zealand, a document on the Society of Friends in New Zealand was prepared[17], with favourable comments, comparable to those of the 1903 deputation. One of their main observations concerned the distribution of Friends in New Zealand. It noted that while there were four cities of moderate size only half

the population of Friends lived in these cities while the rest were scattered around the countryside. At the same time the Meeting for Sufferings was also compiling a report which reached the conclusion that it would take a great deal of work to bring Friends together and would require someone of the stature of Ann Jackson to accomplish this.[18]

Yet while Friends at this stage were looking at the future of the New Zealand Society, it was with perceptions which seemed to ignore their own reports. Very early in the decade there was talk of a Conference of Friends which could be organized as one possibility to help the Society. This had been part of the 1905 report which had suggested the conference as a means to looking to the future.[19] Yet at the same time as sound statements such as these were being made, sweeping generalisations about the status of Friends were muddying these clear waters. One of these, contained in the same 1905 report, talked of the critical position Friends were in, with special reference to Friends' children.[20] This was something that would not have been lost on Friends themselves and they had made some attempt to rectify this.

Was the position so critical, or was it only when viewed from a particular background? The idea of the Conference was welcomed by Friends, especially by those in Auckland, but was also acknowledged to be something that in due time would be accomplished.[21] It was discussed in 1906, with much the same sentiment was expressed but still no ideas on how it could be accomplished. A plan such as this required a strong leader who could capitilise on such an idea and make it work, but

with the death of Ann F. Jackson that someone was not to be found.

Pressure, slight and not too insistent, was placed upon New Zealand Friends in the first few years of the decade after the confirmation of Auckland's status to join in with the newly formed Australian General Meeting, begun in 1902. Wisely, however, they realised that it was impossible for them to do so. The deputation sent to Australia and New Zealand in 1903 observed that while New Zealand was a wealthy and going ahead, transport difficuties were great. This, they realised, was why Friends were reluctant to comply with the proposal that they join the Australian General Meeting.[22] Once again the problem of the geography of New Zealand, and the difficulties faced in traversing it, come to the fore. This deputation gained an insight into the position of Friends which they found to be entirely different from that which they heard about in England.

> There is undoubtdly a higher average of general social well-being than is to be found in the old world, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that the battle of life is therefore an easy one. On the contrary the struggle of the settler with the forces of nature is often very difficult and uncertain, whilst the work of the household devolving upon the mothers is exceedingly exacting and well-nigh ceaseless.[23]

The 1903 deputation, seems to have gained accurate knowledge of the situation which New Zealand Friends faced. Auckland Friends had made tremendous sacrifices to keep the Meeting going, and this the visitors could not have failed to notice. However knowing this information was in their hands, it is hard to understand the comments made by the later Friends

when both visits were for the same reason - helping Friends in New Zealand in any way possible.

The first of these later visits was that of Edward and Edith Annett who arrived in late 1905 and stayed for little over a year. They came, as did the Corders in 1911, in response to the call for help from Friends in New Zealand. This call had been expressed by John Rigg in 1904 and the Yearly Meeting had accepted that it was a priority.[24] On arriving here the Annetts quickly grasped the situation but their comments betray their lack of knowledge regarding the true situation:

> Last time I said I should tell you what I think of the state of Auckland Meeting. The deaths of several Friends, better known by name to you than us, left the meeting very weak, and then the departure of others from Auckland (city), such as Thomas Wright and family, Fletcher Jackson and C.J. Pickard has taken from the Meeting those upon whom the burden of the Meeting would have rested.[25]

These observations on the meeting were to be expected as they came at a time when the losses were beginning to affect the meeting. When a small group loses several of its important members through death it is bound to cause a serious loss of confidence. To some, the arrival of the Annetts had seemed the last hope for the meeting and for the whole of New Zealand. They themselves made the observation that for the good of New Zealand the Meeting in Auckland needed to be strong. For if a meeting in the city of Auckland with its 70,000 people could not be sustained then, they reasoned, what hope had any other centres.[26]

Yet was this necessarily the case? Auckland as we have

seen in earlier chapters, had had no influence over other centres, and even at this time it was still incapable of looking after its own affairs. True it would be a beacon of sorts for Friends in New Zealand but to make such a sweeping generalization about the effects of Auckland is quite incorrect. This will be seen when the other centres are examined in greater detail later in this chapter.

When reviewing Auckland's situation in mid-1906,after having been there six, months Edward Annett repeated many of his previous observations but one in particular revealed clearly his English perspective. This was his observation that **'the meeting never was really strong'.** Coupled with this was a wonderment that the meeting had survived with its loss of numbers.[27] By whose standards was he judging the relative strengths of the meeting? If it was by the standard of the English meeting, then certainly Auckland was not strong. Yet for a meeting which had only been organized on a solid basis for eighteen years and had only been a recognized Meeting for Discipline for six, they were in a good position. Auckland had struggled to attain the position it had come to in 1900, and with the loss of members through death and removal it is natural that it would again have to struggle to maintain its present position. Despite these losses the attendance of the meeting was still kept up at a reasonable rate but this does not seem to be have been taken into consideration. The attendance seems to have been between 9 and 12 although it may have at times been lower.[28] A Meeting for Worship and one for Discipline had been kept up, yet Friends themselves realised

that things were not as well as they could be, and when discussing it with the Annetts they expressed hopes for improvement. Thomas Wright, a member of long standing was especially hopeful that the Meeting survived for his children's sake.[29]

A feature that was both proving a hindrance to the building up of the meeting, and contributing to the pessimistic perspective taken by English Friends, was to rear its head again during this period. For once more the scattered nature of Friends in New Zealand, but more particularly in Auckland Province, became a barrier, meaning that any members who could have taken up the mantle of Ann F. Jackson's ministry were effectively cut out. While Thomas Wright lived only 10 miles out and Fletcher Jackson only 7 miles out of Auckland, at this time, these were a considerable distance. The geographical distance between of Friends is an aspect of New Zealand which was nver fully understood by visiting English Friends. They were used to well settled towns with adequate road and rail transport to all places, and even though Edward Annett explained in his letter that Wright and Jackson struggled to get to the Monthly Meeting and Meetings for Worship, there is still a lack of real appreciation of the problems that were caused by the distance from a city. The distance of 7 or 10 miles to the English visitors may not seem difficult to travel in England, but to the two Friends mentioned this meant what today would be the equivalent of a back country farmer making the journey into a major city from fifty or sixty miles away. Yet despite this

obstacle they remained steadfastly attached to the Society and they had determined that with help Friends could once again build up numbers and strength. Auckland was, in spite of the prophecies of doom, attempting in its own way to surmount this problem of Friends living at great distances from the Meeting.

> The subject of our duty to those members of our Society who are not able through distance or other causes to join with us has been brought before this meeting, and the clerk and assistant clerk are requested to communicate with such members previous to our next Two Months Meeting encouraging them to make an effort to attend and extending to them a cordial welcome. At the same time assuring those living at too great a distance to join with us, of our loving sympathy with them in their isolation.[30]

One area where the Annetts' English perspective came through strongly,was with regards to the Meeting House. As seen from the quote at the beginning of this chapter, its location was the main bone of contention. After a period of six months in Auckland it was still a topic on which great emphasis was placed. The Annetts regarded it as in entirely the wrong place and reasoned, perhaps wrongly, that a change of suburb would help build numbers.[31] Friends had already had recruits to their membership before these Friends arrived, and this despite the position of the Meeting House. What is more while Edward and Edith Annett were in Auckland, Friends continued to receive membership applications despite the supposed bad positioning of the Meeting House.[32]

It is not part of the task of this thesis to investigate the Sociology of the sect nor the idiosyncracies that were peculiar to Friends. However to explain the idea of English

Friends that Friends in New Zealand had too much integrated themselves in to the society in which they found themselves, a brief outline is necessary. When Herbert Corder and his wife arrived in New Zealand in 1911 the country seemed strange and hard to acclimatize to. They found New Zealand somehow 'un-English', though they heard English spoken which reminded them they were not in a foreign country.[33] To these two Friends it seemed clear that Friends had lost much of their distinguishing identity.

To understand this view one must go back to the arrival of the first Friends in New Zealand in the early 1840s'. On arrival their 'peculiarity' which marked them as Friends would have been clearly evident, with dress as the clearest example of it. A Quaker man, such as Thomas Mason, wore a collarless coat and broad brimmed hat. His wife, Jane, would have worn a bonnet and a choice of plain unornamented clothes in darker colours. If this were not enough then their distinctive speech patterns would have been a second, and perhaps more readily identifiable characteristic, especially their use of the second person singular and an avoidance of conventional names for things such as weekdays and honorary forms of address.[34] These 'peculiarities' are a feature of the sect as it tries to put distance between itself and the world.

> Members of a sect are conscious of their alienation from their environment, and frequently they strengthen and emphasize this by adopting distinctive patterns of behaviour, by compelling group endogamy and/or by refusing to obey some of the State's laws.[35]

While some of the above features applied to New Zealand

Friends, not all did. One of the main reasons, and one that has been used in a different context is the lack of numbers. A group can only retain its identity if it has the numbers to enforce the practices and beliefs of the group. Individuals or small groups can only do this for so long before they succumb to pressures from the society in which they live. Again the study of the ways in which this happened to many of the forms of peculiarity is not part of this thesis, however one form which can be examined briefly is marriage.

The Corders noted that one reason why Friends were in such a weak position was because of so much 'marriage out' as Friends term it. They thought this, combined with the friendships among non-Friends which it brought, lessened the already weak links between Friends in New Zealand.[36] The prohibition against marriage out had been dropped approximately twenty years before but the tradition was still strong. It had been based on a biblical injunction against 'being yoked with unbelievers' and was a reflection of Friends belief in themselves as a 'peculiar people'.[37] The dropping of the prohibition in England had been partly due to the growing acceptance in the nineteenth century of the values of the environment in which they lived in.[38] This process was begun in New Zealand at a far earlier stage but grew more out of expediency than acceptance of thewider valuesof New Zealand society.

Acceptance of the need to marry non-Quakers does not mean that Friends totally lost their identity, nor does the loss of many of their other forms of peculiarity. For example, letters

to Friends in England still started with the informal 'Dear Friend....', and their stand on Compulsory Military Training, two examples of this sense of identity that still remained both to be examined later in this chapter. An explanation of this is that members of a sect were 'convinced of the truth of the groups tenets'[39] and did not ever abandon them completely.

> The sense of kinship, the sense of isolation from 'the World', though modified, continued to exist. To take an illustration from the sphere of language, the Quakers officially abandoned their distinctive patterns of speech. Yet they continued to use many words and phrases peculiar to Friends.[40]

Thus as, New Zealand Friends, despite the apparent lack of 'distinguishing features' found by their English visitors, remained faithful to their traditions and beliefs.

In other parts of New Zealand the Society was slowly developing and growing, this is particularly so in Christchurch and Dunedin. However the most rapid growth had occurred in Wellington. As recorded in previous chapters the only Friends resident in the Wellington region up till this period had been Thomas and Jane Mason. However in 1896 Ann F. Jackson and J.J.Neave, the same one who was mentioned in chapter two, met with John Rigg and his wife who had moved into the region recently. They held a meeting at their house which was also attended by Thomas Wardell, Samuel Mason and his children, John Grubb and Alfred Gregory.[41] No information is known as to how long this meeting had been in existence, but along with Thomas Wardell, Rigg seems to have been the founder of the Meeting for Worship in its various forms. Growth and development seem to have been very slow until 1902.

In this year arrived Sarah Jane Lury and Elizabeth B. Rutter who had had it "laid upon them" to come out to help the Friends in Wellington and Christchurch. From a Meeting held in the room of a Friend in that year, it was decided that a weekly Meeting should be held. These were at first held in rooms in Vivian Street but transferred at a later time to the Druids Hall on Adelaide Road.[42] This Meeting seems to have carried on without interruption until 1907 when an important turning point came with the opening of the Hostel.

This Hostel was one of the reasons which Sara Jane Lury and Elizabeth Rutter had gone out to New Zealand.The Hostel was started initially out of a concern - mostly expressed by English Friends but no doubt echoed by those in New Zealand- over the lack of education in Friends' beliefs and principles for their children.It was not a new concern, for Thomas Mason had expressed it as early as the 1840's, and when he and his family left New Zealand briefly to stay in Tasmania he put his concerns into action by establishing a school at Hobart. Schools such as these were important to Friends in a number of ways. The friendships made between the children of Friends were carried on into adult life and ensured a strong basis for future numbers.[43] The influence such schools had on relationships between Friends was already beginning to show in Australia. However much the concept was 'desired'[44] in New Zealand, it was not until 1920 that this desire was realised. Yet despite the rejection of any plan for a school at this time, a compromise was found which it was thought could have a similar function to a school, and this was the Hostel.

> A suggestion has been offered which may be worthy of consideration, namely the opening of a Hall of Residence, where the older children of Friends might reside, whilst continuing their education at the secondary schools and colleges, either at Wellington or elsewhere.[45]

Wellington Friends could not contribute to the proposal except to give it their practical support. New Zealand Friends as a whole were receptive to the proposal but in the beginning it was wholly the responsibility of English Friends. Sarah Jane Lury who was in New Zealand at the time suggested that a house which would be large enough to accommodate children be started in Auckland or Wellington. The house would cater for Friends children and those of others who would be attending High School and other institutions in those cities.[46] The Hostel became a focus for Friends in Wellington and the starting of such a place was the hoped-for catalyst for growth of the small Meeting. One of the primary missions of Lury and Rutter was to have the meeting move to the building[47] Despite support for the idea Friends in New Zealand were for a time dubious as to the desirability of such a place beginning. They raised two principal reasons why they were doubtful: One was whether it was in fact wanted and secondly whether it actually answered a need.[48]

Despite the optimism, however slight it may have been, generated by the Hostel's appearance, when the Annetts arrive the picture painted by them is not quite so optimistic.

> I fear very little comment of mine is needed to make you feel that Wellington Friends are in a bad way. John Rigg has been very anxious to commence a Meeting and perhapes some subsidary work, but his limited strength is insufficent for more than a very little and his periodical abscences on business

would be a serious setback.[49]

Wellington it must be said had more problems than Auckland. At least in Auckland the meeting was well established but the same cannot be said for Wellington where the meeting seems to have been a very stop start affair and only really became established after the Annetts had left. Edward Annett commented that Friends' numbers were small and that it would take a great deal of work to gain numbers sufficent to 'share in the business of the meeting', which it seemed was the responsibility of non-Friends.[50] Although this picture is somewhat of a depressing one the reality cannot have been that bad, for a few years later the meeting seems to have been in a much healthier state. The major contributor to this seems to have been the Hostel which in this case seems to have fulfilled one of its functions. From reports, the reactivated meeting for worship was growing and an adult school was started,which John Rigg took a great interest.

The years leading up to the Conference seem to have been ones of struggle for Wellington Friends and from a report in the Yearly Meeting Minutes of 1907 the reasons were clear. While Wellington was quite willing to open a meeting their numerical weakness prevented them doing so.[51] Yet three years later in 1910 the meeting had shown tremendous growth, and in that year a meeting which had been held on December 13th 1909 had been recorded by the Australasian Committee. At this meeting a 'Meeting for Business' had taken place and a second was arranged to take place at Palmerston North.[52] That such major developments could have taken place in such a short

time, and during the supposed 'time of crisis' is a tribute to Friends overcoming the situation they were in and carrying on despite it. The comments of Herbert Corder in 1911 in light of this seem hardly credible.

> We have been pleased to meet with the Friends here and feel hopeful that some more permanent arrangement for a Meeting in a public place rather than in a private house as at present, will be agreed upon. Friends are very timid and fearful.[53]

Friends' reluctance to become a public meeting was largely because as they felt the internal development of the Meeting was to be completed before the external could be contemplated. This is yet another point which the visiting Friends failed to grasp, that of the pace with which Friends in New Zealand developed. It was to be at a pace with which they were comfortable with, not a headlong rush, which is what seems to have been the wish of these English Friends.

With the development noted by the Australasian Committee, Wellington had reached a watershed. Fletcher Jackson was able to report to the 1910 General Meeting that Wellington,had after a time of struggle, now become a more settled meeting.[54] The work of Sarah Jane Lury and Elizabeth Rutter in connection with the Hostel was influential in this growth and the holding of the first gathering of New Zealand Friends in Wellington Friends indicated that there were in a healthy position. A combination of these factors produced the situation which arose in 1911, when Meeting for Sufferings received a message through the Corders that the Meeting in Wellington be recognized as a Meeting For Discipline and be given powers similar to that of Auckland. This was on behalf of the

'Wellington, Hawkes Bay, Half Yearly Meeting'.[55] Despite its weakness, Friends in Wellington had made connection with Friends in other districts and had begun to organise with them. This is reflected in the suggested boundaries of the new meeting which included the provinces of Hawkes Bay and Taranaki.[56] If the situation was still so critical it is unlikely that Wellington Friends would have suggested such a major development in their meeting.

Two further factors illustrate the response of New Zealand Friends to the challenge of the so-called crisis. The first was the need for a group identity. The Meeting for Sufferings had pointed out in a report of 1904 (mentioned above), that if New Zealand Friends were to continue it was essential that 'some corporate life' be organized recognizing unity Friends held in faith and ideals.[57] The second was a need for further organization at the individual meeting level. The Quaker organisation began with the Preparative Meeting which became a Monthly Meeting and groups of these made up a Quarterly Meeting who sent representatives to the Yearly Meeting. However only the second level had been reached by the two Meetings by the close of the period. It was Thomas Hodgkin, a visiting minister, who in 1909 called for this organisation and Wellington was quick to respond to it. New Zealand Friends were making an effort despite the obstacles to develop this sense of corporate identity, and Wellington hastened this in a small way by holding its meeting in a number of centers around the region it encompassed. For example one of its Half-Yearly Meetings was held in Palmerston

North, thus building a sense of unity among its scattered members.[58] This picture of the meeting is a much healthier one than that drawn earlier and is a direct result of the effort to emphasize this 'corporate life'.

Dunedin during this period provides us an example of a centre which firmly contradicts the gloom filled observations of the English visitor. Friends recognized here they were not strong, but this did not stop them from maintaining some form of meeting, as well as the Sunday meeting Meetings for Worship held in both the mornings and evenings, there were bible readings, missionary meetings for the younger members and talks on Friends principles.[59] Dunedin showed quite plainly the reality of Friends' situation in New Zealand, and negates very firmly the sweeping statements of the Annetts, such as this one made after they had toured the whole country.

> Now that we have spent time in each of the 4 main towns of N.Z. and are able to view carefully the state of religious activity in our Society of each. I think we sadly recognize certain signs of hopelessness, we are compelled to acknowledge the failure of Quakerism in them.[60]

Dunedin was clearly evidence that these "signs" were not all true. Dunedin Friends,like those of Wellington held only private meetings in one of the houses of the four families who made up the meeting. It was private for the same reason that Wellington's was, the wish to develop internally before doing so externally, and because Friends in Dunedin did not feel strong enough yet to.[61] Despite this, the meeting was strong in both its commitment and its faith. What it lacked was organization, both internally and externally which would

strengthen the meeting to a point where they could venture into public. One of the tasks that Herbert and Mary Grace Corder undertook when they came to New Zealand was to build up the meetings in Christchurch and Dunedin,[62] however they may have not been so needed in Dunedin.

When these two Friends arrived in Dunedin at the time of the third Conference, Friends' circumstances do not seem to have changed much, yet they were willing to take on the huge task of organizing a Conference. They did so with much energy, after having some misgivings about the task before them.[63] While acknowledging their limitations they were prepared to welcome an event such as this, for it was to help them as much as it was to help Friends as a whole. Still the most pressing problem on the minds of Friends in Dunedin was finding a leader:

> John Wardell who has the chief influence says that unless they had a sound and interesting Ministry it would be impossible to make a change - his wife and Mrs. White would welcome it and I am sure the 8 younger Friends in the meeting would favour a public meeting place - there is no one with courage enough to take the lead or accept responsibility except Katherine White and she thinks that until Friends generally have more courage and less fear and are quite agreed that the time has arrived when the change may be made with a unanimous sense that it was the right thing to do, it is best to leave the present arrangement to continue.[64]

The last centre with a significant Quaker population at this time was Christchurch. Unfortunately Christchurch was in the same position as Wellington, in that its meeting was a very irregular event. Visiting Friends, as seen in the last chapter, started Meetings for Worship, but as soon as they had left the city the meeting lurched to a halt. This situation

had not changed, with all the visiting Friends to New Zealand during this period experiencing some of this frustration. Once again however, Friends who were living in Christchurch were more aware of the reality of their situation than the visitors. When a proposal for a Meeting for Worship was presented to a small meeting of Friends they rejected it as they felt both unequal to the task and unable to keep up a meeting.[65] Again the problem was the lack of enough Friends to sustain a meeting. Despite the smallness of their numbers in Dunedin, they were strongly bonded to each other and this commitment kept them going, but the same cannot be said of Christchurch. Despite the obstacles, the Yearly Meeting reported in 1907 that they had a sincere wish to start a meeting but the lack of numbers which them. Friends' adaptability to the conditions could only be taken so far and the attempts to start a meeting floundered because of this. Friends in Christchurch knew their strengths and weaknessess, and had realised at this time that they were too weak to commit themselves to a continuous meeting. The Yearly Meeting also realised that it was one thing to try to keep a long-established meeting, even if it was small, for this gained support from other meetings around it. It was a different thing to start a meeting whose only support came from England, on the other side of the world.[66]

Despite the outlook which had been hopeful for Friends in 1900, the years to 1911 were not as bright as had been expected. Christchurch was an example of this unfulfilled promise, and when the Corders arrived in 1911, the situation

had not progressed much from that of four years earlier. One of the problems was that because of a lack of communication, Friends were often ignorant of one another. "At our First Sunday we met 12 Friends at Mtg. at the Y.M.C.A. but there was no evening Mtg. Our many visits during the following week showed us that Friends did not know each other."[67] The answer for this was found in holding social gatherings so that Friends got to know each other. Out of these came the desire and eventually the move to form a permenant Meeting. When they left Christchurch, Herbert Corder felt that things were rapidly improving in the city.[68] The 16 to 20 people who began to gather at this time were the beginnings of the Preparative Meeting, eventually to become a permanent Meeting in Christchurch which was to grow and develop even further. Yet there was already a base from which the Corders could work and once again we see the reality of the situtation, one which was often different to the English Perspective.

By the time the Corders left New Zealand the Society seems to have passed through its supposed crisis period of 1906-07, an interpretation which was due in part to the visit of the Annetts and the Corders. The visit of the Annetts in Auckland was 'encouraging to Friends' and while they were there the attendance at the meeting was above average for the first time for a long time.[69] Yet the fact remains that despite needing the help of these visiting Friends, events were never as bad as portrayed and certainly they were not as gloom-filled before these Friends arrived. In 1904 Auckland was receiving applications for membership, which is hardly the

picture of imminent collapse. Certainly John Henry Benett, Josiah and Mary Hames, Ella Harbrith and William B. Matheson[70] thought there must have been some hope of the meeting surviving, as they joined during this time. The same could be said of all those who joined during the crisis years of 1906 to 1911. If the meeting was in such a bad state then why join?

When Thomas Hodgkin planned to visit New Zealand in 1909 one of his aims was to attend a conference and he recommended that Friends in New Zealand be written concerning the organization of such a conference.[71] The idea of holding a Conference was not new as seen, earlier in the chapter, however whenever it was suggested Friends felt the time had not quite arrived for its organization. It was seen as a necessity for Friends as a whole to progress, and the paper prepared for the Meeting for Sufferings in 1904 best sums up the aims of such a Conference.

> Efforts should surely be made now and continually to bring Friends together so that they may unitedly consider what form of organization is possible under their circumstances, and what other means can be adopted for strengthening the bonds which bind Friend and Friend and for deepening spiritual life. The organization of a Conference to be held in some central place will require much preliminary labour, but if the need for such a gathering is recognized we believe that the way will be made clear.[72]

What was needed was some Friend English, or New Zealander, who was to be the motivating force behind a move to organize such a Conference. Such a person was Dr. Thomas Hodgkin.

Thomas Hodgkin was a man of immense standing among Friends. His legal and banking background and his historical scholarship were such that he could 'reach the world with his

spiritual message' as no-one else could.[73] He had been recorded a minister in 1909 and was known for his preaching and his saintly life. His son George who came with him, had visited New Zealand six years earlier. When his father had mentioned to George that he would like to visit Friends in Australia and New Zealand he had exclaimed that they should all go and that he would act a a courier.[74] Hodgkin's daughter, Lucy Violet Hodgkin, was to keep the family contact strong as returned to New Zealand in latter years. So on the advice of his son, Hodgkin in his seventy-eighth year set out with his family for New Zealand. Wilfred Littleboy reminiscing on the visit suggested that they might be thought of as members of 'the Quaker aristocracy'. When they travelled through New Zealand they were accompianed by a valet and maid and perhaps thirty pieces of baggage.[75] Thomas Hodgkin was the catalyst for the Conference, and without his visit there may not have been one for a few more years.

In his organization he was helped considerably by Sarah Jane Lury and Elizabeth B.Rutter, who had both now been in New Zealand for a number of years. Of them, the London Yearly Meeting records:

> We understand that no report will be given as to the service of S.J. Lury and E.B. Rutter, though the former has returned home, but we would put on record here how greatly we have appreciated the services of these warm-hearted Friends of New Zealand, and bear our testimony to the fact that but for their persevering exertions the first Conference of Friends ever held in New Zealand would not have been the great success it has been.[76]

The Meeting, which took place in 1909, signals a new era, just as the recognition of Auckland Meeting in 1900 had done. Now

Friends could look upon themselves as a collective body rather than four separate meetings of varying states of organization.The Meeting was significant in that Friends made a collective leap in internal and external development simultaneously. They also had the chance to meet each other and establish the bonds of friendship which this enabled. Through the Conference the focus of many Friends now changed from Auckland to this new meeting. Despite this loss Auckland was not bitter, they were as overjoyed as was everyone else with the success of the Conference.[77] The next conference held in Auckland seems to have carried on the success of the first one[78] and with a name change is still being held to this day.

A first the Conference was still feeling its way to its function: Auckland was still the nominal overseer of New Zealand Friends but in 1911 this role was to be gently nudged from them even more. That year the Conference was held in Dunedin and Herbert Corder, whose earlier prouncements on New Zealand had been tinged with the English Perspective, reported it with a completely different attitude. "With the passing of so many whom we have known and loved at home there is a great encouragement to us coming into touch with the throbbing of new life and earnestness of purpose among so many young Friends have in New Zealand."[79] Friends had always exhibited this earnestness of purpose, they simply needed some activity to channel it into and the Conference was the activity they had been waiting for. The most significant point to come out of this Conference was the changing of its name, from "Annual Conference" to "Annual Meeting" described by Joesph Taylor as

a 'very definite forward movement'. The changing of the name is significant from a developmental viewpoint, and shows that Friends were beginning to gain a sense of how this important Yearly gathering was supposed to function. Also at this meeting there was an attempt to organize preparative meetings in places where Friends resided,[80] a decision which was acted upon with some swiftness, in both Christchurch and Dunedin.

One of the major features of these early gatherings was the lack of Meeting Houses in New Zealand, an expectation which is yet another follow-on from this English Perspective. The Yearly Meeting often talked of the need to gain a public meeting place in each major centre that Friends resided in. They felt that such a move would strengthen the meeting by attracting members to it.[81] Numbers were important to the English Friends,who at this time were experiencing a decline in their own numbers, and this concern with numbers was projected onto New Zealand Friends in the form of a concern at the lack of Meeting Houses. It must be said however, that numbers would not have preoccupied New Zealand Friends to the extent which English Friends would have wished. Still, they were willing to explore the possibility of obtaining a site for a Meeting House. Herbert Corder reported that Auckland was in the throes of looking for a new site for its meeting house, while Wellington Friends were being urged to look for a site before they again baulked at the thought. Meanwhile in Christchurch, Friends had found rooms in the local Y.M.C.A. and Dunedin continued to consider the matter.[82]

Decisions such as these being made at the Annual Meeting

indicated that the internal development of Friends was beginning to flow over into decisions which were previously the domain of the London Yearly Meeting. This move towards quasi-independence from the London Meeting was to grow even further but it was limited in the ways it could be expressed, especially because the Meeting needed substantial financial help from the Yearly Meeting. While Auckland, and Wellington in the immediate future, were to gain powers of Discipline, the Annual Meeting had no such status and could not achieve much without these. Still the decisions made by them with regards the Meeting House issue, and the peace issue (to be discussed), would have held considerable influence over New Zealand Friends by virtue that it came from their own equivalent of the Yearly Meeting in London. This acceptance of the decision making and the development that it represents, is not the progress made by a group which is in a deep crisis; neither is it yet the deep involvement in the issue of peace which began to become an important issue to Friends during this period.

It was clear to Herbert Corder that from his reading of the newspapers of 1911, there was widespread and strong opposition to the Defence Act of 1909.[83] Friends involvement in the peace issue was to become more public. It was we have seen not a new concern for Friends (with Thomas Mason, John Sylvaneus Cotterell, Frederick Tuckett and Samuel Strong all being involved in putting forward Friends pacifist beliefs) these Annual Meetings there had been no unified voice on the issue. The whole population of Friends was involved in

confronting the issue but for the most part it had been Auckland Friends who had been most vocal in their opposition to the various Government pronouncements on war and related issues. For example in 1900, the Meeting for Discipline appointed two of its number to observe events with regards to the appointment of a government drill instructor, hoping to have a clause permitting removal of their children from such a drill.[84] This foreshadowed the more serious inclusion in the Defence Act of 1909 of the compulsory training of children from 13 to 18. The 1900 Bill which was to have made this law was not passed during the session of Parliment in which it was presented, but Friends now had a special interest in such actions and were determined to keep a close eye on them.

The next concern in this area of Friends activities seems to have developed in 1907 a letter was sent to the Minister of Education:

> As a society which holds the belief that war is inconsistent with the spirit of Christ and contrary to the letter of the New Testament, we have watched unto prayer and thanked God for every sign of the times showing progress towards that day when 'Men shall learn war no more.' Just now, when we have special reason to rejoice in the manifold trend away from barbaric war, and towards brotherly arbitration, we deeply deplore the increase of military organizations in this country which is in so many ways in advance of others in matters of national reform.
>
> We earnestly desire that Ministers should use their personal influence against measures calculated to foster the war spirit in child or man, and support only such as will inculcate in the minds of the rising generation truer ideals of patriotism, courage and duty than those embodied in mere physical force. We also respectfully submit that complete freedom of conscience and action may be accorded to all in the matter of military drill, joining cadet corps, or any compulsory military action.[85]

Nineteen hundred and eight was election year, the perfect opportunity to attempt to influence the thinking of incumbent and would-be politicians on this most important issue and a letter was sent to all candidates. The letter is also a definitive statement of the stand of Friends on this issue:

"UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING"

To the candidates at the election of 1908.

Dear Sir,

As representitives in Auckland of the Religious Society of Friends, a Society which throughout its history, has borne testimony against war, we desire to call your attention, in common with other parlimentary candidates, to the agitiation which is now being carried on for the introduction of compulsory military service, to ask that you will use your influence against it.

This agitation, which is originated by the Defence League, and fostered by the Press, rests only on the persistent and quite unproved assertions of its advocates. The fear of invasion is no new thing...Those who believe it to be a duty to arm and drill in the defence of our country are at perfect liberty to do so, as volunteers, and to persuade as many as they can to join them, and they ought to be content with this and not try to force the conception of duty on those whom their arguements have failed to convince.

The introduction of compulsory Military training would destroy that liberty, the attainment of which, after long ages of struggle, is the crowning glory of our national history, and for those that believe with us that all war is necessarily wrong it would be an infringement of that freedom of conscience which, of all our liberties, has been most hardly won and ought to be held the most inviolable.

On behalf of the meeting held at
Wakefield St. Auckland, Nov. 8,1908
J. Fletcher Jackson[86]

The publication of this and the previous letter were delayed answers to a question which the deputation of 1903 had asked about what influence the Society could have in New Zealand. This was how the Society could be a 'effective instrument in God's hands' in shaping the different aspects of

life in New Zealand.[87] More than this however, is that it reveals that in Auckland at this time a tremendous amount of external development was taking place. This even further evidenced in the opposition that they produced to the Defence Act of 1909 and its ammendment in 1910. Their major target was Clause 92 of the 1909 Act which stated:

> 92 (1) Nothing in this Act shall require any person to bear arms or perform or undergo Military Service or training if the doctrines of his religion forbid him to do so, but every such person shall be liable to perform as an equivalent to such service and training such non-combatant duties as are prescribed by the Govenor in Council.
>
> (2) The burden of proving exemption under this section shall rest on the person claiming exemption.[88]

The principal opposition of Friends to this clause was the narrowness of the interpretation as to who was allowed to claim exemption. Friends had argued, in 1908, for the freedom of all to claim exemption on the grounds of conscience, yet here was legislation allowing only those whose religion forbade them to fight being allowed to claim exemption.[89] One objection to the Act was that even if forbidden by their religion to refrain from fighting, they remained were under Military control. Friends were opposed to this provision, and during World War One opposition to it was to result in many being sent to prison. In 1911 the Annual Meeting turned to this issue and at once it became not simply a regional concern but a nationwide one. At this meeting the issue which most animated Friends, was not so much Clause 92, but another clause in the same act, 35.

> 35 Subject to the provisions of this Act,all male

> inhabitants of New Zealand who have resided therein for six months and are British subjects shall be liable to be trained as prescribed as follows:-
> (a) From twelve to fourteen years, or to the date of leaving school, whichever is the later, in the Junior Cadets, and
> (b) From fourteen years of age or the date of leaving school, as the case may be, to eighteen years of age, or in the case of those attaining the age of eighteen are attending a secondary school, then to the date of their leaving school, in the Senior Cadets.[90]

Friends had been afraid of this happening those in the Wellington and Palmerston North area agreed on action after the government had in April of 1911 named the end of that month the final date for registering under the Act. Most Friends it seems, after much correspondence recommended that their sons be registered and then their parents claim exemption.[91] At the Conference later in the year this solution was endorsed but not by all Friends.

This development of their involvement in the peace issue was taken a step further when again in 1911 they attempted to see the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed forces, Maj. General Godley, on the issue of what alternative service they could perform. For the first time since Mason, Tuckett and the others in Nelson had objected to the war, Friends were again deeply involved. Wellington Friends visited Robert Pudney and his family at Herne Bay, for their son was resisting the authorities attempt to coerce him to serve.[92] A year earlier J.K. Allison was visited by Auckland Friends[93] when he asked advice on what steps to take involving his son. For these people and their families to take such steps required them to have confidence in their principles and the Society they

belonged to. All through 1911 Friends came to have a deeper and deeper involvement in this sensitive issue. Whether it was Herbert Corder speaking at meetings on the wider aspects of Militarism, or as a whole group allying themselves with the National Peace Council, or even as individuals such as Egerton Gill - a person who will figure prominently in the last chapter - was an active participant in the Peace Society, Friends began to play an increasingly active part in the peace issue, which became the most visible expression of Quaker presence in New Zealand. These moves were not those of a Society in trouble. For Friends to venture this far in defence of one of their most treasured principles required a certain amount of confidence and stability of the Society as a whole, a vision which is in total contrast to that which the English Friends at times portrayed.

Yet there was still internal work to be done. Before they left New Zealand the Corders set out some suggestions which were primarily to do with internal development, but this is an area where some centres were still particularly weak.

> Suggestions we have made at the special request of a few Friends, and, have given them in modified form to suit each centre.
> (1) That ChCh. and Dunedin Preparative Mtg. obtain powers to admit Fds. into membership and inform Auckland Meeting
> (3) That a Mtg. House site be acquired and a Mtg. House built at an early date.[94]

These two moves were likely to further the growth and development of not only the two meetings concerned but the whole of New Zealand. They realised that they needed more organization, especially having come through a time of

trouble. Fletcher Jackson in his history reflects the growth which had taken place after the "crisis". "From an almost morbid condition in 1906 our meeting has slowly increased in numbers and it must rejoice the hearts of those who during the years of our greatest weakness faithfully held on to see our chasm being gradually filled."[95] The chasm was in effect filled by those who clung on (as he puts it), and this is what Friends who visited New Zealand failed to grasp.

During these years Friends gained a sense of corporate identity, one which would continue to develop. As for the peace issue, Friends and their involvement in it had only just begun, becoming more embroiled in init with the the advent of the First World War. In a sense Friends ended this era at the same stage they had begun it, yet this time their reason for hope was more justified. As the Clerk of the Mtg. for Sufferings put it:

> I do not believe there is a finer field in the world for Friends' principles than in New Zealand, there is not only an openness to receive, but an absense of that prejudice that leads to resist what is true.[96]

While partly true this was to be tested most severely in the period dealt with in the last chapter.

ENDNOTES

E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield June 7th 1906 Letters of Edward and Edith Annetts visit to New Zealand 1906-07 MS Box 17/2 MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library (Hereafter ATL)

Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 31st of March 1901

Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 29th of April 1906

Results of a Census of the Dominion of New Zealand taken for the night of 2nd of April 1911

Continental Cttee MS Minutes (1898-1905) MS Micro 647 ATL p.46

Auckland Quarterly Meeting 14th of 10th mon.1900 Min 5th

This appointed a committee to look into the changes needed.

Meeting of Auckland Quarterly Meeting 11th of 11th mon. and adjournment from First-Day the 14th of 10th mon. last 1900 min.1

Ibid. Min.2 9 Ibid. Min.3 10 Ibid. Min.4

Ibid. Min.5 12 Ibid. Min.1

Yearly Meeting Minutes 1904 MS Micro 647 ATL p.211

Testimonies concerning deceased Friends.A Testimony of the Monthly Meeting of Friends in Auckland New Zealand, concerning Ann Fletcher Jackson, a minister deceased. London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1904 p.245 Micro MS 647 ATL

These Testimonies were appended to each years Minutes and ere concerned with those ministers who had died the previous ear.

Yearly Meeting Minutes 1905 p.184 ATL

Yearly Meeting Minutes 1905 Continental Committee Meeting, 4th of 8th Month 1904 p.205 ATL

Ibid. Report: The Society of Friends in New Zealand p.206

Report: at the Request of the Meeting for Sufferings present the following statement of the position and the

needs of our Friends in New Zealand c1904 MS Box 24/1 ATL

19 Yearly Meeting Minutes Report: Society of Friends in New Zealand 1905 p.207 ATL

20 Yearly Meeting Op.cit.

21 Epistle from Auckland Monthly Meeting of Friends to London Yearly Meeting 1903 MS Box 14/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

22 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1903 p.211 ATL

23 Ibid. Report of the Australian Deputation

24 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1905 p.207: Report, Society of Friends in New Zealand. ATL

25 E.A. Annett to Friends on the Committee Dec.5th 1905 ATL

26 Annett to Friends Op.cit.

27 E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield June 7th 1906 ATL

28 Annett to Crosfield Op.cit. 29 Annett to Crosfield Op.cit.

30 Auckland Two Months Meeting of Friends held 11th of 9th Month 1904 Min.4

31 E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield June 7 1906 ATL

32 Auckland Two Months Meeting 11/3/06 Min.5

33 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 28/3/1911 Circular Letters from Australia and New Zealand of Herbert and Mary Grace Corder's visit 1911 MS Micro 647 ATL

34 Isichei E. Victorian Quakers p.145

35 Isichei E. From Sect to Denomination in English Quakerism with Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century. The British Journal of Sociology, Vol.15, (1964), p.207

36 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 28/3/1911 ATL

37 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.146

38 Isichei, From Sect to Denomination p.208

39 Ibid. p.219

40 Isichei, Victorian Quakers p.164

41 Abridgement of Pudney R. 'A Quaker Chronicle' File 33/8/2 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.20

42 Theodore Rigg biographical letter on his Father to Ruth Fawell p.2 Folder 33/3/11 MS Papers 2597 A.T.L

Series 33/3 of these papers consists of biographical material on various Friends through letters received by Margret West and Ruth Fawell in researching their book 'New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972'

43 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1907: Australasian Committee Report ATL

44 London Yearly Meeting of 1906 in its Continental Commitee Report raised the question of desirability of a school but as is seen from the footnote immediately below, rejected it, on the grounds it was not yet time for such a venture.

45 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1906: Continental Committee Report ATL

46 Australasian Cttee. MS Minutes Vol.1 MS Micro 647 ATL p.50-1

Following the decision of London Yearly Meeting 1902 to approve the establishment of Australia General Meeting,it was agreed by Meeting for Sufferings in Sept.1903 to appoint a committee of the General Meeting and,as far as possible,to give any advice and assistance that may be asked for from time to time.The committee was appointed in Oct.1903.This committee was known as the Australia Committee,was entrusted in 1906 with the added duty of corresponding with Friends in New Zealand,and its name was changed to Australasian Committee.

47 The Australasian Committee in the above Minute thought it desireable until a building (Meeting House)or room was available that the meeting would be held in a room in the Hostel.

48 Rutter E.B. Account of Founding of Friends Hostel, Wellington N.Z. p.2 MS Box 2/4 MS Micro 647 ATL

49 E.A. Annett to Mr.Crosfield 13/8/06

50 Annett to Crosfield Op.cit.

51 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1907: Australasian Committee Report ATL

52 Australasian Cttee. MS Minutes Vol.3 p.51 ATL

53 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 4/5/1911 ATL

54 Jackson F. The Past History of Friends in New Zealand File 33/8/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.47 (Inset)

55 Mtg. for Suff. MS Minutes Vol.53 p.452 MS Micro 647 ATL

56 Australasian Cttee. MS Minutes Vol.3 p.208 ATL

57 A Report on the present position and the needs of our Friends in New Zealand presented to Mtg. for Sufferings New ZealandPapers 1871-1904 MS Box 24/1 MS Micro 647 ATL

58 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 25/8/1911 ATL

59 E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield 12/10/06 ATL

60 E.A. Annett to Mr.Crosfield 2/9/06 ATL

61 E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield 12/10/06 ATL

62 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1911: Australasian Report ATL

63 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 10/5/1911ATL

64 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 9/6/1911 ATL

65 E.A. Annett to Mr. Crosfield July 1st 1906 ATL

66 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1907: Australasian Committee Report ATL

67 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 13/7/1911 ATL

68 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit.

69 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1906: ContinentalCommittee Report ATL

70 All the applications were recorded at the Auckland Two Months Meeting of July 8th 1906

71 Australasian Cttee MS Minutes Vol.1 p.296 ATL

72 Report at the Request of the Meeting for Sufferings present the following statement of the position and the needs of our Friends in New Zealand c1904 MS Box 24/1 MS Micro 647 ATL

73 West. M and Fawell. R <u>The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972</u> p.37

74 Wilfred Littleboy to Ruth Fawell August 5th 1967 Series 33/3/8Series 33/3 Biographical Material MS Papers 2597 ATL P.2

75 Littleboy Op.cit.

76 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1910: Australasian Report ATL

77 Auckland Two Months Meeting 14th March 1909 Min. 8th

78 Auckland Two Months Meeting 15th May 1910 Min.2

79 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 10/5/1911 ATL

80 Circular 6 ChCh. N.Z. 26/5/1911 Joesph Taylor Ten Letters 25.3.1911-8.12.1911 MS Box 5.2.3 MS Micro 647 ATL

81 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1910: Australasian Report ATL

82 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 10/5/1911 ATL

83 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit.

84 Auckland Two Months Meeting 22nd of 7th Mon. 1900 Min. 8

85 Auckland Two Months Meeting May 12th 1907 Min 2

86 Auckland Two Months Meeting 11 mon. 8th 1908 Min.7

87 Circular Letter to Friends in New Zealand unspecified date MS Box 24/3 Printed Papers New Zealand 1870-1913 ATL

88 An Act to Make Better Provision for the Internal Defence of New Zealand (24th Dec.1909) Part X Clause 92 New Zealand Law Statutes 1909 p.325

89 Peace and the Defence Act: a brief statement of the positionof the Society of Friends in regard to Defence Act 1909, 1910 (New Zealand Auckland, 1911-12) MS Micro 647 ATL

90 An Act to Make Better Provision for the Internal Defence of New Zealand (24th Dec.1909) Part VI Clause 35 New Zealand Law Statutes 1909 p.306

91 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 16/4/1911 ATL

92 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 24/8/1911 ATL

93 A minute is recorded in the meeting of 13th March 1910 of J.K. Allison asking advice in the case of his son who was compelled to undergo military training andthe Auckland Friends appointed some Friends to help him in his case

94 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 24/8/1911 ATL

95 Jackson, Past History of Friends p.48 ATL

96 The Society of Friends in New Zealand: Report of the Mtg. for Sufferings p.207 London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1905 ATL

CHAPTER FIVE

THE WAR YEARS AND THEIR IMPACT ON FRIENDS 1911-1920

> We feel bound explicitly to avow our continual unshaken persuasion that all war is utterly incompatible with the plain precepts of our Divine Lord and Lawgiver and with the whole spirit and tenor of his Gospel and that no plea of necessity or of policy, however urgent or peculiar can avail to release either individuals or nations from the paramount allegiance which they owe unto him who hath said, 'love your enemies.'[1]

For Friends, the period 1911 to 1920 was dominated by one issue: their reaction to compulsory militarism. From 1911 it was this area that saw most of the growth and development that took place among Friends. For the benefit of Friends and other religious objectors, many clauses would be inserted in Acts and many regulations promulgated acknowledging their beliefs. Friends for the most part refused to use these for the simple reason that the clauses did not take into consideration the conscientious objector. Much of the time during the war was spent on trying to win the same privileges for these objectors, and to this end Quakers became part of many organizations both opposed to war, and trying to help the conscientious objector.

While it is true to say that the war and all that it entailed played a major part in Friends lives, there were other issues which took place during this time. Of these, the most significant was probably beginning of a Friends School. Between 1914 and 1919 committees were set up and donations

gathered from English and New Zealand Friends, so that by 1919 it was possible to make a definite plan to start the school.[2] When opened in 1920 it was the culmination of many Friends' hopes and with it begins another era in Friends history. The School, and the organization which it represents, is one form of the internal development which was continuing among Friends. The events of the 1913 Annual Meeting, Christchurch Preparative Meeting of 1914, along with the happenings taking place in Wellington, Hawkes Bay and Taranaki Monthly Meeting, were all responses to Dr. Hodgkins' call of 1909 to organize. Friends were further strenghtened during this time by the upholding of their peace testimony by the younger Friends who went to jail for various reasons. The picture which one is left with in 1920 is a Society which is strong, vital and one ready to grow and develop even further from the base it has gained.

Although Friends' vocality on the issues to be discussed in detail here began earlier, it is more appropriate to discuss, briefly here the tradition that meant a stand taken was an expression of the Quaker community. The opposition to war and compulsory military training is not something which an individual must believe in but it is such a part of the life of the body of Quakerism that it is inseperable from the individuals faith. This position was not achieved in a short span of time and a brief examination of George Fox's life and the early Quaker reaction to war can give one a clue to the later integration of the pacifist beliefs of Friends.

In the years following the 'foundation' of Quakerism,

almost all who could be counted as leaders of the sect were imprisoned for suspicion of plotting against Cromwell or Charles II.Indeed under Charles II, especially during the early years of the restoration many thousands of Quakers were imprisoned. Apart from these so-called plots, once the military system was reorganized and became settled, Friends began to come into conflict with its demands.[3] At this time Fox himself was imprisoned for lengthy periods. At the end of the first of these, in April 1650, he was taken before the commissioners whose task it was to raise a local militia under the Militia Act of 1650. Fox was asked whether he would fight for the Commonwealth against Charles I and his refusal is one of the first statements of Friends' opposition to war.

> I told them [the Commonwealth Commissioners] I know from whence all wars arose, even from the lust, according to James' doctrine and that I lived in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all wars.[4]

For this and subsequent refusals he was once more thrown into prison.

For Fox, the circumstances of this particular war were unimportant as were any interpretation of a text. Instead he relied on the contradiction between the 'spirit of war and the spirit of Christ'. For him fighting like persecution was the 'negation of Christianity'.[5] While he was of this opinion he did not force this upon any of his followers, instead he allowed each to follow their 'inward guide' and respond to this in their own way. This was essentially the same response that Quaker communities have relied upon in their stance upon issues such as war and militarism throughout Friends' history.

Pacifism has never been a formal tenet of Quaker belief although as a body it is a recognizable feature. This stems from the known stand they took upon various wars from the time of Fox through the period under discussion up to the present. It had in essence become part of the community. New Zealand Friends illustrated this with their reaction to the thirteen of their number who were imprisoned throughout the war. Friends here had a strong sense of family unity, and the effect of having even only such a small number imprisoned, some as will be seen for considerable terms, was deep and lasting. Friends as a whole were strengthened because of the experience they gave of standing for Friends principles.[6] For them,as for Fox, it did not matter what the circumstances of the war were; they felt the years of tradition giving them strength to carry out their stand no matter what the consequences.

One of the last acts that Herbert Corder performed before he and his wife left in 1911 was to accompany John Holdsworth, Robert Pudney and Wm. Wardell to see Major Gen. Godley. This action, together with his speeches at various meetings, foreshadowed the arrival of W.H.F. Alexander and John P. Fletcher, who came to New Zealand in 1913 to assist Friends in their campaign against compulsory Military Service. The major concern of Friends during this meeting was how they could serve the Government in a non-combatant, civil controlled function. It was this type of function that was to be the focus of much of Friends campaigns on behalf of themselves and conscientious objectors throughout the war. Friends told

Godley that they were prepared to undertake 'non-combatant duty under civil control' which the state might require. To this end they asked what alternative service was being offered.[7] Godley's approach to Friends was the first by the Government, which tried unsuccessfully to accommodate Friends and other religious objectors in successive legislation, as will be seen later in the chapter. Godley's reply to this question looked at first to be a favourable one:

> You know Mr. Corder it is not Militarism at all,... it is an act passed into law by the people and I am simply here appointed by the Government to organize the Defence forces of the country, now I want you members of the Society of Friends to help me with your great traditions and sympathetic natures, you are the very people I want in this Ambulance work.[8]

This would have been acceptable to Friends, yet when Herbert Corder asked Godley what the difference was between St. Johns Ambulance and Military Ambulance?[9] Godley replied that there was no difference.[10] Corder then stated if this was the case then why could not Friends do this non-combatant work. Godley's answer to this was typical of that given in later years. He stated that St. John's Ambulance work was no good because it was outside his control.[11] The deputation could make no further progress mainly due to Godley's statement. All through the war Friends would come up against the same sentiments and this provided the great stumbling block to any successful negotiations over non-combatant service.

The answers supplied to the Government seem to have made no difference to their thinking on the question of religious or conscience objection, as can be seen from the 1912 Defence Amendment Act. In the Act the Government acknowledged that a

magistrate could grant to a person who applied for exemption from military service of exemption, if the magistrate was satisfied that the grounds of objection were that the war was contrary to religious beliefs.[12] The second trap was that the alternative service which could be carried out if the person was exempted would not be in civilian hands.[13] Friends may not have been satisfied by such clauses in the Act but they were more than some members of the Government were willing to give to Friends. James Allen, the Defence Minister, saw the need for 'reasonably broad exemption clauses' for those who were clearly religious objectors and was always more liberal on this matter than many of his collegues.[14] Allen argued for his amendment in the house against considerable opposition, but the Minister had realised that the previous Act in 1909, had not made provision for religious objectors. He stated in the debate upon the new Act that the definition of a religious objector under the 1909 Act was 'unsatisfactory' and proposed a clause that would allow a religious objector to show he was genuine in his objection upon religious grounds.[15] The Amendment was relevant in the final analysis to only one group of objectors, this of course was the Quakers. This meant that the Bill had a major defect in Friends minds.

The defect was that the conscientious objector was still not covered by any legislation, although in the House Allen confessed:

> that I am unable to bring down any legislation dealing with the conscientious objector. I should have been glad to have done so had I been able to discover any possible way out of the difficulty. The subject of the conscientious objector is so

> surrounded with difficulties that I cannot conceive of any legislation that would cover the matter.[16]

Friends were of the opinion that all who objected to Military Service should be exempted and together with the military nature of the non-combatant service led them to develop links with other groups who also objected to war and military service. The first of these links was forged with the fall of Sir Joseph Ward's government in 1912. T. Mackenzie formed a government which was however short-lived, lasting not more than a year. Arthur Meyers was chosen as Defence Minister but his position and that of his government was unknown with regards to prosecutions of objectors under the 1909 Act. To ascertain what their position was, Charles Mackie and James Worral arranged for a deputation, consisting of a wide range of delegates among whom were the Society of Friends, 'to consult with the Minister.'[17] A year later, as prosecutions of young boys mounted and Friends began to feel the bite of the authorities over their "inflexibility", an individual named Egerton Gill became prominent, linking Friends and other groups. Gill was to play a prominent part in Peace activism throughout the war. Initally his organ of protest was called the Liberty League but was then changed to the 'New Zealand Freedom League'. This held its first meeting on 4 April 1912 in the Friends House in Auckland where one of its first Acts was to adopt as its immediate object the repeal of the compulsory clauses of the Defence Act.[18] Friends began to take an interest at this time in the cases of individual conscientious objectors, beginning an increasing involvement

by Friends in this important area. One such case was that of Albert Grahem who was, in 1912, charged with failing to 'render service' under the 1912 Defence Act based upon the grounds of conscience.[19]

As more and more of such incidents occurred it was not surprising that Friends' concern and interest began to grow and develop further. The Yearly Meeting in London was especially interested in the issue of the conscientious objector, so much so that it formed a joint Sub-Committee with regards to the Defence Acts of Australia and New Zealand. This committee urged strong support for groups such as the Anti-Militarist Society in New Zealand and monetary help was forwarded to the organization.[20] It also showed an interest in Friends' cause by sending out the husband wife team of William and Harriette Alexander to help those who were 'suffering, Friends or otherwise', because of the Defence Acts both in New Zealand and Australia.[21] They were later joined in 1913 by John P. Fletcher, another Friend sent out to assist New Zealand Friends.

At the Annual Meeting held in 1913 New Zealand Friends took the opportunity to make one of the many statements upon Friends position with regards to the issue of Compulsory Military Training.

> This meeting concludes that it is the duty and privilege of Friends afresh to declare their unwavering adhesion to the principles of Peace as they have been held by our Society for over 250 years, and after a careful deliberation, they see no other way of consistently upholding their testimony than by declining to undertake any duty that will bring them under military control or the operation of the Defence Acts. Nor can they define

> any alternative duties that, whilst meeting the consciences of some may violate those of others.[22]

Friends were becoming increasingly less flexible on any compromise from the position which they had taken, as seen from the above statement. Notice that it is from the Annual Meeting of New Zealand not the London Yearly Meeting. The focus for New Zealand Friends had taken a change of direction when it came to what course to take on this issue. As 1913 progressed Friends involvement in the fight against compulsory militarism developed a personal touch. Thomas Parr informed Friends in February of that year that his son was to be prosecuted for not registering under the Defence Act and was refusing to comply. Auckland Friends sympathised with him and left it to individual Friends to help him in any way.[23]

Prosecutions such as this one were the exception rather than the rule in the period before the war. At this point the bulk of the prosecutions were of conscientious objectors, and through organizations such as the Freedom League, Friends kept a close watch on the situation. In the three years between April 1913 and February 1916 there were nearly 800 cases heard in Auckland. One court, in Onehunga, also heard cases regularly. The highest figure during this time belonged, it is thought to Christchurch. Here 400 cases were heard in February 1914.[24] With the non-working of the exemption clause in the Defence Amendment Act the government had a dilemma which required a solution. One possible way of doing so, Allen hoped, was to institutionalize a programme of alternative service for religious objectors. This alternative service had

been provided for in the Act, but its precise nature and the terms under which it was to be put into operation had not been dealt with by the Defence Department. To this end he made two attempts to deal with with this question. Firstly he asked the Quaker community to advise him on services which would be acceptable to the religious objector and secondly he sent a questionnaire to all councils in the country asking them if they were willing to provide public work for the religious objector.[25]

In the same year, 1913, Friends visited the Minister of Defence. This meeting, to which the Prime Minister also attended, was undertaken by W.H.F. Alexander, John Percy Fletcher, and a women, who may have been Alexander's wife. Alexander began the Meeting by acknowledging that the Government had treated members of the Society of Friends with great consideration, and that Friends (up till that time at least), had not been prosecuted except in one or two cases. Friends had however not come to plead their own case, although Alexander did put across that they had had no request from others to represent them. However they did wish to represent to the Government that every man had the right 'to live according to his conscience.'[26] Alexander then moved on to correspondence with the Minister of Defence regarding a Dannevirke youth and two cases in Taranaki where exemption from military service on the ground of religious objection was refused by the magistrate. Alexander also questioned whether recommendations to legislate on behalf of all who objected to the Defence Act,[27] would be acted upon. At this,

the early stages before the war, the issue for Friends was one of gaining exemption not just for themselves but all who objected. The Prime Minister then took up the question of where the Friends in the delegation came from, seeking to question their authority to question New Zealands policies, to which Alexander replied, they were from England. John Fletcher taking up the argument stated that they looked to countries in this part of the world to provide 'haven and rest' to those who suffered from 'religious disability'.[28]

Despite the best interests of Allen, nothing was achieved by either side, although in replying to Friends' statements concerning the Joint Defence Committee, he did clarify its function.[29] Allen's parting question to the deputation was to ask what types of alternative service could be asked of the religious or more particularly the conscientious objector. This particular tack was however a losing one. Friends in answering, adhered to the statement they had made on alternative service in 1912. In this they had refused to define any service 'whilst meeting the conscience of some may violate those of others'.[30]

The previously mentioned questionnaire sent out by Allen in 1914 seems at first to have been a genuine attempt by Allen to find a solution to the problem of alternative service. The letter which he sent out left no doubt that this alternative service was to be run along the same lines as military service. The letter stated that some 'equivalent service' of a non-military nature should be required from those who objected to military service.[31] This was one reason

given by Allen for sending the letter. The letter then went on to explain that this civilian work should be of use to the community, and the final explanation of the nature of the work left the person who was reading it in no doubt concerning the military aspects of the work. The time to be spent undertaking such alternative work should be equivalent to the military duties of members of the Territorial Force and Senior Cadets. Further if they were undertaken in a camp, they should be paid as if the amount of work was the same as anyone in a military camp.[32] This leads one to wonder if there was any real heart behind the letter. Before the writing of this letter, conscientious objectors had not been considered a separate category of objectors. Allen in 1912 had admitted that the subject was so 'surrounded with difficulties' that he could not conceive of legislation that would cover them.[33] He latter admitted to being confused as to the actual difference between the two classes of objector.[34] Yet in the letter to the local bodies his attitude seemed to have been changed. He thought the number of religious objectors to be small, only sixty-nine having been exempted. If the exemption was extended to conscientious objectors then the numbers would increase. Clearly he saw that there was a difference.[35]

The basic idea of the letter was for the bodies who had been sent the letter to suggest 1) What work would these local authorities provide? 2) What would the most suitable method of supervising this work? 3) Would these local authorities do the administering? and 4) How to allot time for this work? The local bodies were also asked for any other

suggestions they may think of. The experiment could have been a tremendous success for Allen in his attempt to find his solution, but a large dent was made in his hopes by the answers he received. While some local bodies replied favourably, most had no idea how they could help and the majority were hostile to any form of civilian work being given to objectors. The Eltham County Council's answer was short and sharp: "objectors should be disenfranchised."[36] The answer given by the Mount Herbert Council could be termed as a statement which reflected the views of most country people. They could not offer employment and regretted the Act had been ammended to allow men to claim any objection.[37] The exercise was made a complete failure with the answer that Friends supplied (mentioned above), which left Allen and the Friends firmly back at square one. With the failure of this exercise the last chance for exemption for conscientious objectors had gone, and never again were the conscientious objectors to have such a chance. While Friends would continue the battle on their behalf, as will be seen, it was always one of fighting a losing battle.

The year 1913 was also a year in which Friends became more practical in linking up with the various peace groups that had grown up. Egerton Gill's Freedom League was one such group.[38] In Christchurch the Preparative Meeting was held in Charles Mackies' National Peace Council rooms and Friends there were active in this group. During the 1913 Annual Meeting Friends reiterated their position with regards the 1912 Amendment but were divided on the conscience clause and

its workings.[39] For Friends the issue was clear cut. Were those who objected on conscience grounds able to obtain relief under the amendment. The Annual Meeting had stated that the clause regarding objection 'rightly interpreted', did provide release from compulsory training to any who held, or might be 'persuaded to hold that war was contrary to the teachings of Jesus'.[40]

The Meeting concluded its discussions by again stating that exemption should be granted to all who were against war for reasons of conscience. At this time London Yearly Meeting through the Australasian Committee was sending its support to New Zealand Friends. One such form of support was an Epistle to Friends which endorsed the position of New Zealand Friends. The interesting fact to come out of this Epistle is that London Yearly Meeting while not supporting Militarism, puts forward that some sort of service should be rendered. They emphasized that 'good citizenship' meant that some service was required. They qualified this by stating that it was not to be under military control.[41] Despite such protestations, the government seems to have been unmoved in its attitude towards conscientious objectors. Throughout 1913 and 1914 there were continual prosecutions. In Christchurch Friday became known as 'Crucifixion Day' becuase this was the day the court dealt with cases involving breaches of the Defence Act.[42] While turning a deaf ear to the protests of various groups, the number of prosecutions, and the opposition of Friends and other groups seemed to have been on the edge of making the working of the various Acts a failure.

However the success or failure of the Act and Friends' contribution to either was rendered academic with the outbreak of war in August 1914. With this event occurring the treatment of Friends under the Acts that were to follow was to be much changed.

This quickly became evident with the conviction of Egerton Gill, not under any Defence Act, but under the War Regulations Act of 1914. He was prosecuted under Section 4 of the act, which forbade anyone from committing an act by themselves or with anyone else 'against a regulation made under this Act'.[43] Gill was fined under this section for publishing a circular letter which he sent to each member of the House of Representatives, which it was stated 'being likely to interfere with recruiting etc.'[44] This charge was brought against him after the government had published a regulation in July 1915 promulgated under the Act of 1914 which had specifically stated it was an offence to publish material 'which in any manner indicates disloyalty or disaffection in respect to the present war'.[45] While Gill appealed, he was unsuccessful, and this brought home to Friends that they could no longer rely on their known stand to protect them.

The Defence Acts of 1909, 1910 and 1912 had made overseas service voluntary, it was only for internal defence that the scheme became compulsory.[46] In 1915 rumours began to circulate that the government would conscript men for the army, compelling all men of military age to register as a preliminary. Friends were informed of this rumour by Ernest

H. Wright, who asked if the Meeting (the General Meeting of 1915), would protest against conscription. Friends replied discussed the matter but concluded that as no such registration proposal had been made public they could not discuss it.[47] While they did not discuss the issue at this meeting, before they met the following year the rumours were proved correct. The National Registar as it became, had come into being through the National Registration Act of 1915. It was the second clause of the Act which was to raise the most protest among Friends.

> 2(1) The Governor may from time to time, by Proclamation, require the male residents of New Zealand between the ages of seventeen and sixty years to furnish to the Government statistician at Wellington, within such time as may be specified in the Proclamation, particulars in the prescribed form as to the matters hereinafter specified in section four hereof.[48]

Later in the Act the particulars which this clause mentions are listed. Friends along with others endorsed the form for registration with a statement to the effect that they were not prepared to undertake any work if it was compulsory.[49]

The Act of 1915 had another major effect besides those regarding registration. This was the rapid progression towards a position of cohesion on the issue of compulsory Military training. This position is reflected in a statement made by Auckland Friends at a meeting called to discuss the Registration Act.

> The general decision of the present meeting appeared to be that, provided in registering nothing further than the return of information, were required, Friends would be doing the right thing in forwarding such information, but that at the same time it should be made clear that Friends

> would not consent to military service or domination in any form whatever.[50]

This imitated a concern which had been evident at the last general meeting, and was reflected also in the statements which were being sent to New Zealand by the London Yearly Meeting and its various committees. One such statement, sent by the Australasian Committee to young male Friends, urged them to remain firm in the beliefs Friends held on this position. The statement commented that it was hard to refuse when so many of their friends were doing so. They urged young Friends to instead take the longer view and by doing so they would see the justice of their stand.[51]

The case of Egerton Gill, mentioned earlier, helped to push further into the public eye Friends' beliefs on peace.At his trial, the evidence on which he was prosecuted had a form attached to the registration form. This had stated that while the person was registering in conformity with the governments demands that person could not for conscience reasons take part in any military service or employment which made it neccesary to take a military oath.[52] In the origional case he had been found guilty of the offense, and was fined fifty pounds. In his trial the policies of the Freedom League were read out in his Defence, and it is not surprising that many of them were remarkably similiar to those of Friends.

> Mr. Tole [who was Gills lawyer], I will direct your Honor's attention to these respective Books [Minute books of the League]. Book No.2 speaks of the objects of the League on page 2...Then page 13 your Honor, they speak of Limiting Militarism. Page 42 they pass resolutions against alternative service.[53]

In his appeal, Gill's lawyer pleaded that the League was legitimately opposed to conscription and fearing that this would happen through the introduction of the National Registration Act, sent the form to his members so if they wished to send it in they could. Gill was not using the Freedom League as an arm of Quakerism but by his stand as a known Quaker he furthered Quaker beliefs. Another solicitor in his argument against the conviction, put forward a case very similiar to Friends beliefs.

> They have the right to advocate it, but they [Lord Roberts conscription party], cannot deny the right to other people to oppose it, and I fail to see that a declaration of intention to oppose the Government, if they bring in conscription, can possibly interfere with recruiting. I grant that the less opposition we have to the Government the better in times like the present, but surely a citizen is within his rights, in saying that he would oppose certain measures if brought into Parliament.[54]

Despite such arguments as these, his conviction was upheld.

Gill's trial once and for all shattered the illusion of Friends being among the privileged religions and in 1916 this was reinforced. The introduction of conscription which Friends were so much against became a reality in 1916 with the passing of the Military Services Act. Once again Friends, this time along with the Christadelphians were provided for in the Act. Allen in the debate on the Bill, once again portrayed himself as willing to help the religious objector but not the conscientious one. In 1916 when debating the Military Services Act, Allen argued against the member for Christchurch North, Leonard Isitt. Isitt had been a strong supporter of the bill in general but had criticised the bill

for lacking one detail[55] but had not succeeded in getting a clause for religious an conscientious objectors inserted. Allen pointed out that he had tried to support him by moving his own clause that would allow Appeal Boards to consider religious objectors as legitimate claimers for appeal.[56] He also failed and the Bill in its first form contained no specific provisions for religious objection, but before it had been passed Auckland had sent a protest to the Prime Minister, stating that the Bill should contain some sort of conscience clause.

> Our opposition is chiefly based on the conviction that civil Government possesses no moral right to control individual consciences. A long roll of martyrs for conscience sake could be compiled of those who have suffered imprisonment, torture, and even death on account of their refusal to enter military service in many countries and through many centuries of world history, and if the Bill referred to becomes law we doubt not that many of our young New Zealand fellow citizens will in consequence suffer for conscience.[57]

Friends were not so much worried for themselves, as for those who opposed war on conscience grounds and this was the main thrust of all their protests. Yet they were themselves torn in two directions by this refusal to serve. Auckland Friends devoted a whole meeting to the subject. The conclusion of the meeting was a desire for Friends to obey the enactment of the government but maintain the testimony they held that all war was contrary to Gods teaching.[58] While the body of Friends were in agreement on their stand over the war, it was left to the individual to decide what his actions would be. A further dilemma was created over the holding of the certificates that were received once enrolled on the

Register, for they allowed normal occupations until balloted. While they were willing to accede that some may gain exemption from combatant service they thought it of little value to most Friends. At the same time they could not admit that a human tribunal was a good judge of the conscience of any person.[59] While it was left to individuals to choose their reactions to the acts, the sense one gets is that the weight of 250 years of tradition could not help but play a part in the choice.

Allen thought that the first drafting of the bill gave ample room for a sensible Board to consider the appeal of a Quaker or any person who could genuinely show that they objected, whether on conscientious or religious grounds, to the war and that he had held this belief for some time.[60] Quakers and other groups were not satisfied by Allen's assurances, and preferred to believe that the effect of the Bill would be to deny them all relief. From this dissatisfaction with these assurances came a deputation of leading clergymen which saw the four senior ministers (Massey, Ward, Bell and Allen), and argued that the House of Representatives had not considered Allen's amendment carefully enough. Out of this meeting came a response in the form of a clause introduced into the Legislative Council by the Attorney-General, Bell, which gave religious objectors a ground for appeal. However this had a catch to it.

> 18) Every man so called up for service with the Expeditionary Force shall take a right of appeal to a Military Service Board on any of the following grounds:- 1(e) That he was on the fourth day of August, nineteen hundred and fourteen, and has since

> continuously been a member of a religious body the tenets and doctrines of which religious body declare the bearing of arms and the performance of any combatant service to be contrary to Divine revelation, and also that according to his own conscientious religious belief the bearing of arms and performance of any combatant service is unlawful by reason of being contrary to Divine revelation.[61]

A further section of the Act also provided an obstacle for any real hope of exemption for objectors. It stated that upon the application for an appeal on religious grounds,no appeal would be heard unless the 'appellant' had signified in some manner that he would willingly perform non-combatant work or services, this included serving in the Medical Corps and the Army Service Corps, which were both under military command, both in New Zealand or overseas as was required.[62] If the appellant did not signify this his appeal would be dismissed and he would be fined or imprisoned. Regulations were printed later in the year showing the form which needed to be signed in the case of such an appeal. "Only the theologically naive could have expected Quakers or Christadelphians to accept the Army Service Corps as a non-combatant unit, and it was difficult to argue that the Medical Corps had no military characteristics."[63] Allen had claimed, inside and outside the house, that Quakers and others would refuse to serve, however no hint was given as to the consequences of this action. The scene was set for some sort of a showdown when it was revealed that nearly all of those who could appeal had refused to sign the form and their appeals had been either rejected or adjourned.[64] With the act and the subsequent dismissal of appeals, Friends found

themselves back at square one with regard to the peace issue. However a further development was about to take place with the jailing from 1917 onwards of individual Friends.

The first of these came in late 1916 with the dismissal of the appeal of Percy Wright. He had objected to being called up for service on both religious and conscience grounds and his appeal was dismissed because he refused to undertake alternative service.[65] His brother Harold, who also appealed, had his appeal held over, but it to was dismissed. For Percy this dismissal of his appeal was the beginning of a long ordeal. After this he was sent to a millitary camp and while there for refusing to render military service he was repeatedly given military detention. Finally he was court-martialled and sentenced to eleven months in prison. When this had expired he was again court-martialled and this time sentanced to two years in prison. This combined sentance being the longest served by a New Zealand Friend. [66] As it had been in the beginning with individuals pioneering the growth and development of the Society in New Zealand, so now events had been taken full circle with the advent of the war.

While not relying on these individuals exclusively for growth and development these individuals, through their stands were to play their part in the development of the Society. From Percy Wright's letters in prison we can gain some idea of what conditions were like for a Friend who chosen to make a stand for his principles. Attitudes were unaffected by time in prison from what Percy Wright could see.

> Tomorrow there will be a general exodus of the oldtimers, 2 R.O's and 3 C.O's, perhaps I should not make a line of demarcation between the two but the R.O's prefer it. Well there are 5 C.O's and 3 others have done their 28 days here and go back to Trentham to rejoin their company or try to, and expect to be court-martialled and sent back here for a further time.[67]

The general attitude of those in prison was not changed by the time they spent there as is shown by Percy Wright's letter to his brother and his mother in April 1917, remarking that apart from the four Baxter brothers he was the longest occupier of the jail and adding that it was obvious that the length of time spent there had not changed his ideals.[68] Percy Wright was to become a symbol of Friends' development in this area of their beliefs. The picture he leaves us with is that of a system that was designed to punish the men who for religious or conscience reasons would not fight in the war. It was designed to sap their strength but obviously was not working. "The consequence of an offence in clink is to be sent here and offence here means bread and water till medically unfit for further punishment then sold good and short over again, also aggravating the authorities unecessarily, at least I think so."[69]

Another Friend who was to distinguish himself in standing for Friend's principles, was Thomas Atkinson Bentley. His case was seen as a test case of the new regulations which had been gazetted on 24th April 1917. These had meant to help the Quakers, but instead Friends found these new rules almost as bad as the old. They still had to sign the form addressed to the commandant and the work they were to perform needed

his approval. [70] To the authorities it seemed that these new regulations would mean Quakers could now escape military control. However, Bentley in his trial pointed out that this was not so. The fundamental objection of Friends was expressed by Bentley when he was asked whether he could see his way clear to sign any documents. In his reply he stated that he could not see his way clear to sign them at present. He had though the Government was going to give religious objectors work that was not under military authority, but by signing the oath you put yourself under military authority.[71] His appeal was naturally dismissed and he was sent to Trentham where he refused to be medically examined and was court-martialled, and sentanced to two years hard labour.

The last individual I wish to look at is John Ainsley Brailsford - who was a journalist and served overseas in the years before the war.

> Committed to Pacifism as a cause there could be no half measures. On medical grounds it would have been a simple matter to have been exempted from military service in W.W.I but John Brailsford had to make his stand against all war an unequivocal one. He was not concerned with with exemption from military service he was concerned with Peace.[72]

It was this kind of dedication to Friends principles and peace that developed Friends beliefs externally, and brought their beliefs to a wider number of people. With his refusal to be exempted from military service it was inevitable that some action would be taken against him. Duly at the Monthly Meeting of 11th March 1917, Auckland Friends recorded that he had been summouned to court on a charge of failing to register under the National Registration Act. The result of this was

the loss of his job and the breaking up of his family.[73]

For Friends the cold reality of what could happen to them if they refused to co-operate with the authorities and accept what had been given to them by law in the way of exemptions was brought home to them by these convictions. Yet for Friends this was not a new situation, and the tradition that was behind these Friends strengthened those who went to prison. Brailsford was sentanced to two years hard labour and when he first stated his beliefs to the officer in charge, he explained that he had thought any other action would be unfair to on others who had been imprisoned and transported for objecting to the war on conscience or religious grounds.[74] Brailsford by making such a stand was taking to a logical conclusion the general policy of Friends, which was to seek exemption not just for themselves but for all objectors. His stand was of the utmost seriousness to him and this is reflected in his remarks to Friends on his departure to prison. They are also a reflection of Friend's beliefs in general and are one of the reasons Friends developed internally during this time. "For God's sake don't let anyone appeal to the Govt. on my behalf. While a single C.O. is in prison or on a transport, my place is with them. But it would be well for our people if an appeal were made for simple even-handed justice under the laws as they are."[75]

In 1918, Egerton Gill, again as a member of the New Zealand Freedom League, was convicted of printing seditious material and sentenced to nine months hard labour. However he was not the only Friend, nor were the others mentioned above,

to serve prison terms or to be affected by the later War Acts.

Fig. 4 New Zealand Friends balloted under New Zealand Military Service Act 1917-18

Served Terms of Imprisonment

At Waikeria Reformatory No,1

John A. Brailsford 2 years hard labour, Walter Duke 2 years hard labour, Edward Dowsett 2 years hard labour, John H.Bennett 2 years hard labour, Robert A. Farrand 11 months hard labour, Percy G. Wright 2 years hard labour

At Kainagaroa Prison Camp

Harold Wright 2 years hard labour, George A. Farrand 11 months hard labour, Percy Gill 11 months hard labour

At Borstal Institute Invercargill

Olaf Isaachsen 2 years hard labour

At Mt. Eden Goal

Thomas A. Bentley 2 years hard labour, Egerton Gill 9 months months hard labour

At Templeton Prison

Noel Goldsbury 11 months hard labour

(Source: File 33/6/6 in MS Papers 2597)

As well, there were several more members who either took service in various forms or were found medically unfit. For these individuals the Society's beliefs meant living them out no matter what the consequences.

While these individuals made a personal stand for Friends beliefs, they were not alone. During the trial of Percy and Harold Wright, Friends were given the opportunity

to speak on their beliefs. The 1917 General Meeting also issued a statement with regards to the Regulations which had been gazetted in 1917 which left the Government in doubt of the Friends position.

> This meeting while appreciating to the full the consideration here shown to the principles of the Society, feels that the undertaking asked for constitutes a bar to the acceptance of exemption under these regulations. The reasons which compel us to take this attitude are in brief:-
> (1) The undertaking does not in any way limit the service which may be required. An objector subscribing to it would be giving a written premise to render any service except actual combatant service, that the military authorities might demand.
> (2) The definite offer of work on State farms as the alternative to Military Service is contained in the memorandum from the Adjutant-General but is not embodied in the Regulations. This offer could be revoked, or the Regulations themselves could be altered or cancelled by Order-in-Council at any time, while the objector would remain committed to his undertaking.[76]

A third objection was that objectors would be placed under military command, which again had always been a major objection of Friends. Throughout all this, Friends continued to grow and develop internally. The hardships faced by the group as a whole gave further impetus to a group identity which had begun to be fostered in the changes to the Yearly Meeting, which will be discussed later in the chapter. One group, that of Young Friends, were drawn closer to Friends through the experiences and Auckland Friends were quick to acknowledge their hardships and the witness they provided.[77]

The latter days of the war saw Friends'external development of this belief begin to influence others in a major way. A minute of the 1917 General Meeting had been sent to members of both houses. Then in August 1917 J. Payne M.P

for Grey Lynn wrote to Friends in Auckland asking them if they wished him to place a question before the Prime Minister asking him to draft an agreement for conscientious objectors to sign which would set out the terms of service required by those who may be exempted.[78] In that same year L.M. Isitt, the member for Christchurch North sent a letter to Friends urging them to set up a petition asking for something to be done about alternative service. It was however a little late in the war for such an action, but by the very fact that a letter had been sent to Friends as a whole or as a body meant that they were recognized as having some influence on events surrounding this issue. As seen from the above list Friends were still being court-martialled in 1918. In March of that year, George Arthur Farrand and his brother Robert were court-martialled.[79] By the time of this prosecution no centre in which Friends had a presence in large numbers had escaped, with at least one of their number being prosecuted. At the same time they also began to appoint visitors to the prisons where there members and others were being kept.[80]

The fact that the war ended in 1918 did not mean the end of Friends protests against the Military. In late 1918 and 1919 their energies were directed at gaining the release of not only their own members who were in jail but also the conscientious objectors, many of whom also remained in jail. Another area they were involved in was appealing against the Military Defaulters List which had been set up by the 1918 Expeditionary Forces Amendment Act. This act had been the outcome of an attempt by Allen to finally include in some

way the conscientious objector in the list of those who could be exempted. This still left the problem of the 'defiant objector' as he was termed. These were the 'rebel and the coward', those who had not objected out of conscience. In these cases it was suggested that a more severe punishment than that already given be served. Genuine hard labour and deprivation of all civil rights such as the right to vote or hold public office were suggested as alternatives.[81] It was intended that Amendments leading to the relief of the conscientious objector and the above penalties would be brought in on Nov.8, but a few days later the Armistice was signed and instead a few days later the latter penalties were included in the aforementioned Act. Also included was the above mentioned 'Military Defaulters List'. This was composed who had, in the opinion of the Minister of Defence, had intended to 'permanently evade military service in the present war'.[82]

The major penalty for those on the list was the deprivation of civil rights for ten years, however one concession was made in the law to the religious objectors In their case if they had been court-martialled either before or during the war they would not be placed on the list if it was satisfactorily proven they were religious objectors.[83] Once again Friends and other religious groups were being handed a privilege which others were to be denied, and were again understandably to the fore in protesting this special category and that of the 'defiant objectors'. To this end they once more sent a letter of protest to the Minister of Defence,

whose reply exempifies his and other Government members lack of understanding of Friends position. In it Allen expressed a lack of understanding at the attitude of Friends to both the defiant and the conscientious objector. He made much of the fact that many had made sacrifices and had suffered much more than those who by pleading conscience had escaped these hardships.[84]

With so many people in prison on religious or conscience grounds, on Jan. 13 1919 the Cabinet approved the establishment of the Religious Objectors Advisory Board. This was to investigate all convictions by court-martial of offences involving suspected defiant objectors.[85] This may have been a belated response to protest by Friends. Despite this protest Friends who were in prison seem to have been unduly long in being released. The General Meeting of 1919 noted with regards to this: "Correspondence has been read relating to the strong attempt made by Auckland Monthly Meeting to secure the liberation of all C.O.'s. The reply from the Minister of Defence (above) was sternly antagonistic."[86] A month earlier some Auckland Friends who were still in prison held their own personal protest at conscientious objectors being in prison a step further by staging a hunger strike.[87] The action by these Friends was their own personal development of Friends beliefs but it shows how far Friends were willing to go in defence of these and others beliefs. For these and other Friends who were in prison it was not until 1920 that many were released, and gradually the issue receded, not into the background, but to

a position of less prominence. While Friends seemed to have been released from prison the issue was kept alive somewhat with the continued internment of some conscientious objectors. Auckland in particular continued to agitate for the release of conscientious objectors and sent protest letters to this end.[88] The war years were a time of tremendous growth and development in the areas of peace and anti-militarism, they were also a time of great development of unity among Friends, and it is easy to imagine that this was the only area in which Friends grew and developed but this would be a false assumption to make.

Friends' internal growth and development in organizing themselves had moved at a quickening pace. During, the war despite the seeming hindrances, this progress continued. Wellington in 1911 had applied for recognition as a Monthly Meeting for Discipline. At the Yearly Meeting of 1913, the Australasian Committee reported through the Meeting for Sufferings the application.[89] The Committee had also sent to the 1911 Annual Meeting for their comment, which like the Auckland comments had been favourable. The decision of Wellington and the other two provinces in taking this action illustrates the growth and development that had taken place in this area in the few short years that the meeting had been on a solid foundation. While it was at the suggestion of the two English Friends Herbert and Mary Grace Corder, it was solely on the instigation of Friends living in these areas that the application was made. Now more than ever the Society was beginning to develop an identity of its

own. While it was still firmly attached to the Society in England, it was beginning to develop under its own power and without too much help from outside.

One reason behind this was the numbers who belonged to Friends. In the two census' taken buring this period while Friends did not increase by a tremendous amount, their numbers were sustained. In 1916 there was an increase of 20 to 434[90], while in 1921, the figure had dropped slightly to 431[91]. With the numbers stable organization could progress at a faster pace. Some of this number would have been those termed associate members of meetings such as Auckland and Wellington. With numbers being so small the number who fell into this category would not be large. For the most part these numbers would be representative of the Quaker population.

In 1911 with the change of name to 'The Annual Meeting', it was decided that this new meeting would have similar powers to a Quarterly Meeting in England.[92] To have powers similar to a Home Quarterly Meeting meant that the New Zealand Meeting would be able to consider applications from other Meetings for recognition as Monthly Meetings and not have to send these on to the London Yearly Meeting for verification. This was an extremely important decision on their part, for it meant a great deal more autonomy for them and decreased a great deal their dependence for decision making on the London Yearly Meeting. It represents a milestone in development for Friends, for it was totally their own idea to make such a move, and that it was made such a short time after the

inception of the Meeting. The Australasian Committee on hearing of the decision exhibited what might be called a slight umbrage at the way New Zealand went about its decision: "if it is the wish of the First Annual Meeting that this should be done, it would be well that application should be made to the Meeting for Sufferings or the Yearly Meeting in due form as was the case in the setting up of the General Meeting for Australia."[93] It may be that the Australasian Committee was concerned for due process and while this new status gave New Zealand Friends a certain amount of autonomy it was to be many years before the New Zealand Friends were given complete running of their own affairs (1964 to be exact). The status which New Zealand Friends accorded themselves in 1911 was not officially granted until 1913, and when it was given the Meeting for Sufferings was highly pleased that such a move had been made.[94]

The first opportunity to use this new status, and the powers that it bestowed upon the Meeting came in 1914. In this year Christchurch Preparative Meeting applied to the Annual Meeting for recognition as a Monthly Meeting.[95] The most important fact is that they applied for recognition not to the Yearly Meeting in London or any of its committees, but to their own Yearly Meeting for this recognition. Another fact which makes this an important development is that Christchurch in common with Wellington had only been a stable Meeting for a year or so. A year earlier it had made an application to become a Preparative Meeting and at this time had once again not applied directly to Yearly Meeting. It did

however apply to the Australasian Committee, not for recognition but for advice.[96] In both cases they bypassed the traditional method of procedure,showing the growing confidence New Zealand Friends had in their own organizations.

From this point in time Friends began to take charge of their own affairs as the Annual Meeting (changed in name again in 1914 to General Meeting), developed in great strides to become a Yearly meeting in all but name. The one area where Friends could never hope to gain independence was in finance. Even after this period and still to this present day, Friends in New Zealand rely on English and other Friends for financing large projects. These efforts to help must not be seen as attempts to influence Friends in New Zealand as has been stated before. They are simply a helping hand being given in a time of need. The development of the Annual Meeting was as important during this time as had been the development of Auckland in the previous two chapters. Increasingly it became the focus of New Zealand and overseas Friends, instead of Epistles being adressed to the Auckland Meeting they were all now adressed to the General Meeting of Friends. The Australasian Committee did in fact inform Auckland that it would no longer be sending it Epistles once the General meeting was established. As the General Meeting developed so too did Friends meetings in other places, and the state of the Society as a whole began to show healthy signs. In the 1916 report on the State of the Society Friends reported small amounts of general progress had been observed.[97] Despite the progress the report sounded a warning that there was much work

still to be done.[98] The fuller organization of Friends as the Australasian Committee called it was of great assistance to isolated Friends. It gave them an opportunity to occasionally attend a conference and keep in touch with Friends they had met.[99] While much was still to be done by 1920 Friends would have looked back and seen that they had made a great leaps forward in developments since the beginning of the decade. There were three established Meetings for Discipline, under various titles, and they had an established Yearly Meeting which had almost all the powers they required at the time. This allowed them to exercise a certain amount of autonomy with regards to internal and external affairs, and finally they had fulfilled a long cherished dream, that of having a Friends school in New Zealand.

As early as the 1850's, Thomas Mason had worried about the lack of education of Friends children in New Zealand not just in his time but for those who would follow. When he and his family were in Tasmania, after leaving New Zealand for a period due to the Land Wars, he set up a Friends School and was its first headmaster. When the Deputation of 1903 arrived they were delighted to meet the children of Friends but they felt worried by the lack of knowledge of the links which bound their parents to the Society in England. Also they felt the State Schools lacking in two respects: the lack of religious teaching in Friends beliefs, and the large number of friends the children had outside Friends circle because of their attendance at these schools.[100] The only suggestion that the deputation made to alleviate the problem, was that Friends in

England send appropriate literature to the children. The next instance that education is mentioned is in a 1905 report to the Yearly Meeting on the State of the Society in New Zealand. In it the following comment was made:

> The next few years, humanly speaking will decide the future of the Society in New Zealand. The children of Friends who have emigrated from home in a little while, as they become the heads of families, will either drift from all religious communities or cast their lot definitely with local churches.[101]

Among the solutions, to this and other problems they forsaw, they advocated the establishment of a school or failing that a home of residence under Friends care.[102]

This idea of establishing a home or residence, led indirectly to the establishment of the Friends Hostel in Wellington. It was seen as a compromise, as the opening of a school at the time (1906) was not seen as appropriate at that moment. In 1907 Sarah Jane Lury and Elizabeth Rutter offered theirservicesas the ones to open such aHostel.Atthe time, Friends in New Zealand were beginning to wake up to the idea of a school. However at this time it had not taken root except insofar as they had a wish to keep their children in touch with the Society. To this end some sent their children to Friends school in Hobart but obviously this was only for a few.[103] The Hostel had at first meet limited success. In 1913 the Yearly Meeting reported that it had become a valuable center of Quaker activity not only for Wellington but New Zealand.[104] Also reported was the fact that the students who attended the Hostel were overwhelmingly non-Quaker, thus while begun with good intentions the Hostel was failing to

meet the need it was begun for.

The major impetus for a school to begin came in 1913 with the following minute recorded at the Annual Meeting:

> John Holdsworth has laid before us his earnest desire for the establishment of a Friends' school in New Zealand. He is convinced from wide observation in Australia and Tasmania that the Hobart School has far-reaching influence in helping the growth of Quakerism in the Commonwealth and he believes the same benefit may be reaped here.[105]

The push that had come from English Friends to establish a school was now coming from New Zealand Friends instead. This is a further sign of the continuing development that was taking place internally amongst Friends. Now the goals had turned from short-term growth and development to the long-term. With the decision to go ahead Friends took a strong grip on their own destiny in terms of how they would grow and develop. Once they had made a decision to go ahead they did so with great haste. They set up various committees which collected subscriptions and by April 1916 they had collected 6,000 pounds. Of this 2,000 had been donated by John Holdsworth.[106] Money for the project inevitably came from elsewhere, this being England, but the planning and execution were wholly done by New Zealand Friends, proof positive that they were the ones building the Society.

The School represents the Society's attempt at continuity within its own ranks, as they were of the opinion that the State system while good in some ways was not in others.[107] Events progressed at a rapid pace from this time on and by 1919 the stage was set for the building of the school, at Wanganui which already had a few Friends resident

in the area. The opening of the school in mid-1920 represents the end of the time period of this thesis however it is the opening of a new era of growth and development for Friends. Education was of paramount importance to Friends, through it Friends' beliefs were transmitted to their children. Herbert Corder when visiting Dunedin in 1911, remarked of John Wardells' sons that the three, who had been to Hobart scool, were all very loyal to their school and to Friends, unlike their sister who had not been to the school.[108] Most Friends who came to New Zealand were graduates of one of the Quaker Schools that were dotted around England and from their experience of the schools they came to a realization that this was what was needed to ensure the continuation of Friends. The school represents the final piece in the jigsaw of internal development that took place during this period, and it ensured that Friends would keep developing in the future.

By 1920 Friends were well pleased at the events which had occurred. They had three settled and established Meetings for Discipline, a General Meeting which had all the powers of a Quarterly Meeting, which were quite sufficent for New Zealand at this stage of its development. They had just begun to ensure their future with the opening of the school, and they had gained a certain amount of autonomy through these developments. They had come through a testing time in the war not unscathed but certainly with principles intact and having gained a great deal of external development through their stand. The Auckland Meeting could report to the General

Meeting of 1920 that the Meeting for Worship was regularly held and well attended, with an average attendance of 27.[109] In 1920 a glimpse of this new era can be had with the beginning of a new meeting for worship with the beginning of the school. On Feb. 20th 1920 the Wellington Meeting reported that a new meeting had begun on February 22nd 1920.[110]

In 1909 Friends had been called by Thomas Hodgkin to organize themselves. The years 1911-1920 despite the intervention of the war, were a small but glowing vindication of this call. Despite being a group activity, individuals still had an important part to play in this organization. They also should not be forgotten for the part they played in the growth and development of the Society through the stand they took during the war. They proved worthy successors to those individuals that have been mentioned before them. Thus in 1920 the Society stood on firm, if still slightly shaky ground. This last decade stands as a fitting climax to the years of struggle that had gone before them and the 1919 General Meeting in Auckland states this very well indeed.

> As the reports will be printed, there is no need to give details, but we are to record our conviction that, in spite of the unsettled and disorganized times, on account of the war and its consequent upheavals, there has been a lengthening of the cords and a strengthening of the standards of the work of the Society generally, and a greater measure of spiritual insight and growth has been attained, which should give an impulse to future service.[111]

ENDNOTES

1 Pamphlets relating to conscription and war 1903-1912 Friends Book of Discipline Chapter 14 Section III Peace among Nations Statement 4 MS Micro 647 Alexander Turnbull Library (hereafter ATL)

2 West M. and Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972 p.62

3 For fuller treatment see Hirst M.E. The Quakers in Peace and War: An Account of their Peace Principles and Practices

4 Fox G. Journal Vol. 1 p.69 In Friends Book of Discipline Chapter 14 Section III Statement 1 ATL

5 Hirst M.E. The Quakers in Peace and War p.44

6 West and Fawell, The Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.73

7 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury (on route to Hobart) 5/9/1911 Circular Letters from Australia and New Zealand of Herbert and Mary Grace Corder's visit in 1911 MS Micro 647 ATL

8 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit. 9 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit.

10 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit. 11 Corder to Cadbury Op.cit.

12 Defence Amendment Act 1912 Clause 65 Section 2 New Zealand Law Statutes 1912 p.71

13 Ibid. Section 3

14 Weitzel R.L. Pacifists and Anti-Militarists in New Zealand 1909-1914 New Zealand Journal of History Vol.7, No.2, (1973), p.139

15 New Zealand Parlimentary Debates (hereafter NZPD) CLXI(1912) p.93

16 Ibid. p.92

17 Weitzel, Pacifists and Anti-Militarists p.137

18 Ibid. p.142

19 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends Dec.8th 1912 Min.8

20 London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1912 p.104: Report of the Joint Sub-Committee on Australasian Defence Acts MS Micro 647 ATL

21 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends Dec.8th 1912 Min.4

22 Report and Proceedings of Fourth Conference and 1st Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand, ChCh. 1912 p.12

23 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 9th of 2nd Month 1913 Min.8

24 West and Fawell, The Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.68

25 Weitzel, Pacifists and Anti-Militarists p.146

26 Friends Deputation to the Minister of Defence 19/12/1913 File AD1 227/9/1 National Archives p.1

27 Friends Deputation Op.cit. 28 Ibid. p.2 29 Ibid. p.4-5

30 Weitzel, Pacifists and Anti-Militarists p.146

31 Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representitives (afterwards AJHR) 1914 H-19c p.1

32 AJHR Op. cit.

33 NZPD CLXI (1912) p.92 34 AJHR 1914 H-19c p.93

35 AJHR 1914 H-19c p.1 36 Ibid. p.3 37 AJHR Op.cit.

38 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends April 13th 1913 Min.10

39 Proc. and Min. of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand, Havelock North Camp 1913 p.6

40 Annual Meeting Op.cit.

41 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1913 p.163: Australasian Committee Report

42 Weitzel, Pacifists and Anti-Militarists p.147

43 War Regulations Act 1914 Section 4 New Zealand Law Statutes 1914 p.128-9

44 Egerton Gill vs. Sergant Detective Hollis Series 33/6/11 MS Papers 2597 A.T.L This was an appeal of the original case

45 Regulations under the War Regulation Act 1914 Clause 4 Section 1 New Zealand Gazette 1914 p.2473

46 West and Fawell, The Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.69

47 Extracts from the Minutes and Proceedings of the General Meeting of New Zealand Friends: Wellington 1915 Min.38 p.12

48 National Registration Act 1915 Section 2 Clause (1) New Zealand Law Statutes 1915 p.67

49 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1872 p.162: Australasian Committee Report ATL

50 Minutes of a Special Meeting of Auckland Friends to consider the question of National Registration held at Friends Meeting House on 22/8/15 Minutes of Auckland Monthly Meeting

51 Australasian Cttee MS Minutes Vol.4 p.141
MS Micro 647 ATL

52 Egerton Gill vs. Sergant Detective Hollis p.3 Series 33/6/11 MS Papers 2597 A.T.L

53. Ibid. p.7 54 Ibid. p.32-33

55 The member for ChCh. North Mr. M.L. Issit made an impassioned speech during the 3rd. reading of the Bill trying to gain a clause in the Bill for religious and conscientious objectors but was unsuccessful.

56 NZPD CLXXV (1916) p.782

57 Society of Friends to the Rt. Honourable W.F. Massey May 31st, 1916 Series 33/6/18a MS Papers 2597 ATL

58 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 10th Sept. 1916 Min.13

59 Montly Meeting Op.cit.

60 NZPD CLXXV (1916) p.783

61 Military Service Act 1916 Section 18 Sub-section 1(e) New Zealand Law Statutes 1916 p.90

62 Ibid. Section 4

63 O'Conner P.S. The Awkward Ones: Dealing with Conscience, 1916-1918 New Zealand Journal of History Vol.8, No.2, (1974), p.120

64 O'Conner Op.cit.

65 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 11th of Feb. 1917 Min.3

66 West and Fawell, The Story of New Zealand Quakerism p.45

67 Percy Wright to his brother Ernest and his wife 4.4.17 Series 33/6/5a MS Papers 2597ATL

68 Wright Op.cit 69 Wright Op.cit.

70 O'Conner, The Awkward Ones p.125

71 Appeal by Thomas Atkinson Bentley 20th April, 1917 p.3 Series 33/6/9 MS Papers 2597 ATL

72 John Ainsley Brailsford biography in Series 33/3/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL

73 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 11th Mar.1917 Min.5

74 John A. Brailsford to Mrs. Gill, Egerton and John Gill Aug.6 1917 p.3 Series33/3/2 MS Papers 2597 ATL

75 Ibid. p.12

76 Report of the General Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand: Wellington 1917 p.11

77 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 8th of 7th mon. 1917 Min.6

78 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 12th Aug.1917 Min.3

79 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 10th of 3rd mon. 1918 Min 10

80 Minutes of Four Months Meeting held in ChCh. 3/4/18 Min.6

81 O'Conner, The Awkward Ones p.130 82 O'Conner Op.cit.

83 Expeditionary Forces Amendment Act 1918 Section 9 New Zealand Law Statutes 1918 p.76

84 Sir James Allen to Clerk of Auckland Monthly Meeting 20th Oct. 1919 MS Papers 2597 ATL

85 O'Conner, The Awkward Ones p.131

86 Wellington 1919: Report and Selected Minutes of the General Meeting of The Soc. of Friends in N.Z. 28th June to 2nd July, 1919 p.6

87 Monthly Meeting of Auckland Friends 11 May 1919 Min.3

88 Auckland 1920: Twelfth Report and Selected Minutes of General Meeting of Society of Friends in N.Z. p.17

89 London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1913 p.66: Minute of the Meeting for Sufferings 4th of Tenth month 1912 MS Micro 647 ATL

90 Results of a Census of the Dominion of New Zealand taken for the night of 15th October 1916

91 Results of a Census of the Dominion of New Zealand taken

' for the night of April 17th 1921

92 Australasian Ctte MS Minutes Vol.3 p.210 ATL

93 Australasian Ctte Op.cit.

94 Mtg. for Suff. MS Minutes Vol.54 p.144 MS Micro 647 ATL

95 Minutes of the 4th Preparative Meeting held at ChCh. 9.3.14 2nd Minute

96 Australasian Ctte MS Minutes Vol.3 p.262 ATL

97 Reports and Selected Minutes of the General Meeting of the Society of Friends in N.Z. Dunedin: Apr. 21-25 1916 p.6

98 General Meeting Op.cit.

99 Australasian Cttee MS Minutes Vol.4 p.243 ATL

100 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1903: Report of Australasian Deputation ATL

101 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1905 p.209: Report, The Society of Friends in New Zealand ATL

102 Yearly Meeting Minutes Op.cit.

103 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1907: Australasian Committee Report ATL

104 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1913 p.112 ATL

105 Havelock North Camp 1913: Proceedings and Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand p.6

106 Friends School: For the Society of Friends Wanganui New Zealand p.3 Series 30/4/1 MS Papers 2597 ATL

107 Auckland 1918:Reportsand Selected Minutes of the General Meeting of the Soc. of Friends in N.Z. p.9

108 Herbert Corder to Barrow Cadbury 9/6/1911 ATL

109 Auckland 1920: Twelfth Report and Selected Minutes of the General Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand p.18

110 General Meeting Op.cit.

111 Wellington 1919: Report and Selected Minutes of the General Meeting of the Soc. of Friends in New Zealand p.5

CONCLUSION

From a small group of individuals who were based in Nelson and Wellington in 1840 to the well organized denomination of 1920, the growth and development of the Society of Friends had over a period of time procceded alternately at a snail's pace and at a rapid pace. The slowness of development and growth is clearly seen in the settlements of Nelson and Wellington where New Zealand's first Quakers can be found. The small Nelson group also constituted the first meeting in New Zealand.

Another aspect of growth and development of Friends, especially in this early period, is the way they interacted with the wider community. Cotterell and Tuckett along with Thomas Mason in Wellington were used as prime examples of this, the former two accompaining Captain William Wakefield on his ill-fated expedition to Wairau. Thomas Mason in Wellington was a true pioneer in every sense of the word. It was not until the 1880's that Friends began to inhabit Wellington in any number and all the while he continued to uphold Quaker beliefs on his own. He to was involved in significant events of his time. Several times he had dealings with the Maori, both through being in the vicinity during the New Zealand Wars, and in everyday incidents. One of these was the protracted argument he had with a recalcitrant chief over several of his sheep.

The main gain in having examined these events is that they illustrate how these individuals carried on the principles and beliefs of Friends despite their isolation, contributing to the growth and development of Friends through their active living out of these tenets despite no having the support of an organized meeting. This period, from 1840 to 1860, is also notable for the first major visit by English Friends. Lastly it is also the first illustration of the effect that the geography of New Zealand played on the growth and development of Friends.

Robert Lindsay and Frederick Mackie were not the first Friends to visit New Zealand. In 1833 Daniel Wheeler arrived in the Bay of Islands. He did not stay long as there were no Friends for him to visit. Twenty years later Lindsay and Mackie, Friends, who had just visited Australia, arrived in Wellington. The visit they paid to Friends in both localities marks the beginning of a long tradition that continues to this day. Because of the lack of numbers the two Friends were unable to accomplish much, but one action was significant. This was the opening of a meeting house in Nelson in 1853.

The little group in Nelson was in the habit of meeting whenever they could. Therefore to attract others who were interested in Friends, and to try to encourage more regular attendance, Lindsay and Mackie set up a Meeting House. It did not remain long but it was the first of its kind, and in fact the only one for over forty years. This action could be interpreted as an attempt to influence the development of Friends in New Zealand, but this was not the case. As with

other examples it is merely an attempt by these English Friends to help in any practical way they could.

The next twenty years that were studied were from 1860 to 1880, years are marked by the struggles Friends had to organize themselves into groups.This was especially true of Auckland, where no less than four attempts, in various localities, were made to organize some sort of Meeting. This was caused principally by a migration of Friends to New Zealand during these years. The census of 1878 records 183[1] Friends as being present in New Zealand. The gradual increase from 26 Friends that Mackie recorded in 1853 through to this figure brought with it the likelihood that if two or three Friends were in close proximity to one another then a meeting of some sort may begin. The clearest example of this is seen in Auckland.

Most of these early attempts occurred to the north of Auckland, as this is where many Friends had immigrated. In Remuera and Onehunga attempts were made to begin meetings, yet always the aim of these meetings would be to focus on moving the meeting to Auckland city.

> Rebecca Boot and her daughters remained in Auckland [having apparently moved there from the ill-fated Albertland settlement], conducting a little school in the house in Remuera Road that had been built for them by their distant cousins the Wests, and here Aucklands first Quarterly Meeting was held in 1870.[2]

The first item to be discussed was the possibility of this meeting being held in Auckland. The obvious objection to this was stated by one participant, Dr. Fox, who pointed out that the meeting could not be supported because the few Friends in

the province all lived far from Auckland.[3] Distance between the few Friends who were in Auckland at this time was not the only problem to be overcome in building up a meeting. Friends at this time were also caught up in the general pattern of movement that was affecting New Zealand Society as a whole.

No sooner had the meeting at Remuera begun than it was disbanded. Only one other meeting besides the one described above was held. This was because one of the principle movers behind the meeting, Rebecca Boot and her daughters, removed to Hokitika, after her daughters married the West brothers. This inability to maintain a stable group meant that any meeting which begun was always in danger of disintegrating before it had established itself. A further hindrance to organization, one which is linked to the lack of stability, is the isolation of many Friends. While Friends began to appear in many new localities, often the distance between Friends in these new regions of the country were so great as to prove impossible to bridge. This is not a problem which was confined to this time. It was one which Friends failed to find a solution to for a long period of time.

In the period 1880-1900 some of the problems mentioned in Chapter Two were overcome. Due to the further immigration of Friends into the Auckland Province and the fact that most now stayed, a Meeting for Worship and also for Discipline were begun. Ann Fletcher Jackson played a vital role in this and in the consolidation and organization of the Society throughout New Zealand. It is during this time that the Society in New Zealand really begins. By 1900 the Society is

on a sure and solid footing, in Auckland at least. It is ironic that Jackson had no real concept of what her mission in New Zealand would be,[4] but her mission clarified itself shortly after she arrived and went on to encompass twenty years of visits throughout New Zealand and even to Australia.

During this period came first real evidence that Friends were indeed beginning to establish themselves is with the meeting which was started in 1885. This meeting began with the name 'Auckland Three Months Meeting', and has continued with slight name changes till this present day. The difference between this and the previous attempts at starting a meeting was that the numbers stayed consistent in its early days to enable it to become firmly established. Many who attended the meeting travelled, what in those days were great distances, to attend them. Once again it was the personality of Ann Jackson who helped to establish and maintain the meeting. This meeting begun on such a fragile foundation in its five short years of existence grew and developed greatly, to the point that in 1899 it applied to the London Yearly Meeting for recognition as a Meeting for Discipline. With this application came the responsibilites which had not been faced before, illustrating that Friends were determined to become firmly established in this part of New Zealand.

While this drive for permanence in Auckland progressed rapidly, the same could be said of at least one other place in New Zealand, namely Dunedin. Where, the small meeting which had been centred around The Harlocks house continued to grow and develop at its own slower but steady pace. As time went by

they were joined by other families, together forming a nucleus that drew strength from each other. In Christchurch and Wellington events moved at an even slower pace than that of Dunedin, but there were signs during this period that things were beginning to stir.

The fourth chapter was concerned with by two main issues, the so-called crisis that occurred among Friends, and the blossoming among Friends of their peace principles. In 1900 the application of Auckland was approved and along with the signs in other centres things looked to be on the upswing for Friends. However things seem not to have followed the bright path that was beckoning. Up till about the time of the visit of the Annetts in 1906-07 there is no hint that things are taking a downward trend. Membership of the newly recognized meeting in Auckland was on the increase and the only problem seemed to be the death of some of the prominent members of the Meeting. These included Ann Jackson whose passing hit the meeting particularly hard.[5] It is with the passing of Ann and other elderly and influential members of the meeting that brings about the perception of the crisis.

Friends had always looked to England as a source of help but during these years the calls for help brought to New Zealand three different groups of visiting Friends. The visit of the Annetts in 1906-07 is the one time during which the of despair was most lucidly expressed. Yet three years later the situation has accomplished a complete turn around. From the evidence examined it is easy to see that events had not taken the smooth path anticipated and that there were

problems. However the sweeping statements that were pronounced by the Annetts on the state of the Society would have put it on the verge of collapse. One of the main reasons for this can be explained by examining the background from which these Friends came. While they would have been acquainted with the conditions that Friends in New Zealand faced, it still did not prevent them from forming the perception they wrote in letters to England. A deputation that had visited in 1903 had been in sympathy with Friends' conditions, had realised that there were problems, but had not seen them as serious enough to warrant a prophecy of gloom.

Things were indeed difficult for Friends during these years. Even Friends such as Thomas Wright admitted this, but as a true reflection of the problems the account of the Annetts is too much influencedby their familiar English background. Friends ability to bounce back from these problems is seen in another milestone year, that of 1909, when the first Conference of Friends occurred. First suggested by Dr. Thomas Hodgkin, who visited in that year, the idea quickly caught on and by the time of his visit it had become a reality. It developed in Friends something which had previously been lacking, the sense of corporate identity, that they were indeed a New Zealand-wide Society. That this could occur can be put down to the development of another Meeting for Discipline, this time in Wellington. It was important for the Society that the two events had occured close to each other. Auckland had revived itself from a period of problems but needed these two injections of support

to continue this.

The second great event in this period is the growth and development of Society in its externalization of its peace principles. The first of Friends' many forays into the public eye came in 1900 with the expression of their concern over drill instruction in public schools. In 1907 they further protested the matter, sending to the Minister of Education a letter stating:

> we earnestly desire that Ministers should use their personal influence against measures calculated to foster the war spirit in child or man, and support only such as will inculcate in the minds of the rising generation truer ideals of patriotism, courage and duty than those embodied in mere physical force.[6]

In 1908 the involvement in the issue became even more public with the sending by Auckland Friends of a letter to all prospective candidates of the election that year. In it they asked them to use their influence against universal training. This attempt at philanthropy is something which had long been practised by the English Society and showed the New Zealand Society developing itself further. The following years to 1911 were marked by an ever increasing involvement in this area as Friends linked up with other peace groups and continued to communicate with other government departments.

The last period, 1911 to 1920, is almost exclusively devoted to Friends' involvement in the fight against compulsory militarism, both immediately before the war and during it. Friends campaigned for themselves but more importantly on behalf of all conscientious objectors. In any Act before the war and in all passed during it Friends were

accorded, along with the Seventh Day Adventists and the Christadelphians, a privileged position, which usually entailed signing an undertaking to perform alternative service. However Friends generally refused to take up this exemption for two reasons, the first because this alternative service was usually under military command, which Friends were opposed to, and secondly, if an exemption was not to be granted to those who objected to the war on conscience grounds then they themselves could not take it up. Any attempt by the Government to exempt Friends on religious grounds was usually met with the same answer. This was especially seen in any attempt to accommodate them in some sort of alternative service. Friends staunchly refused to define any form of alternative duties, stating that while this may have satisfied the conscience of some, it may have violated others.[7]

Answers such as this were not well received in the Defence Department and led to Allen, the Defence Minister, quashing any hopes Friends had of gaining exemption for conscientious objectors.[8] With the government taking such a stance then Friends too made their position clear with their "no compromise" attitude towards signing any agreements with the government. "The majority of Quakers continued to refuse the undertaking [given in the 1915 Act] and were gaoled"[9] Friends imprisonment continued a long tradition which had been started at their foundation, and far from weakening their position served to strengthen it. The War years were a time of great trial for Friends but also brought great benefit to

them. Their ability to form a united stand helped continue the growth and development of a corporate identity. While they gained help in their stand from the English Society, their stand accelerated a sense of independence from England.

While the war contributed to the growth and development of Friends there were other factors involved in the process. Two in particular were the beginning of the school in 1920 and the further move to organize, both among the centres and in the Conference. A school had been desired in New Zealand by many Friends from 1900 onwards, although Thomas Mason had expressed concern over Friends children and their education as early as 1846. The education of Friends' children was of great importance to them as it was through the school system in England that they themselves had been inculcated with Friends' beliefs and principles. It also contributed to a sense of group identity, for a school meant that most Friends' children grew up together. The School was suggested, in 1905, as a solution to Friends' education problems at which time it proved impossible to accomplish but the concern kept coming to the fore at various times until in 1913 something was finally done to bring a school into reality.

The man who was the prime mover behind the plan was John Holdsworth. In 1913 the Annual Meeting reported that he had put before them his desire to establish a Friends' school.[10] Once the idea had been positively put forward it was acted upon, for such a small group, with great rapidity. In just seven years the school was established and opened in Wanganui in 1920. Through the opening of this school Friends took a

step towards ensuring continuity, and at the same time developing their independence even further. It ensured that no longer would the children of Friends born in New Zealand remain ignorant of the traditions aned beliefs of Friends. In this way they ensured also a steady flow of new members.

In 1911 the 'Annual Conference' altered its name to 'Annual Meeting' but more importantly it took upon itself the powers of a Quarterly Meeting. This status was formly granted to it in 1913. This status gave them power which would have been unthought of by Friends five years earlier. One of their new powers was the ability to constitute new Meetings for Discipline with only consultation needed from the Yearly Meeting in London. These were used without hesitation on two occasions with regard to the Meeting in Christchurch. It had constituted it a Preparative Meeting and in 1914 then constituted it a Meeting for Discipline. Dunedin was also granted Preparative Meeting status in 1915 but did not apply for Disciplinary powers until outside the period of this thesis. This represents a major achievement on the part of New Zealand Friends to place such confidence in a Meeting so young and it is yet another step in their developing independence. Thus by 1920 Friends had completed a remarkable 10 years of organization and were very firmly established in New Zealand.

Throughout the period of this thesis, there were visits by English Friends punctuating every decade. These have been examined to gauge what influence they might have had on the New Zealand Friends, from the visit of Lindsay and Mackie in

1853 up until the Corders in 1911 who were the last which seemed to involve any commenting on the status of the New Zealand Society. The purpose with which the visitors came is in reality abundantly clear. The first few visits to New Zealand, notably that of Lindsay and Mackie and of J.J. Neave in 1870, were simply missions of discovery to see how many Friends were living in New Zealand and how they could be helped. The nature of these earliest missions was dictated by the number of Friends. While, between 1870 and 1885 there were other visits by English Friends, it is not until the latter year that a visit of any real consequence for is made.

In 1885 Auckland Friends with the help of Ann Jackson were just beginning to rekindle interest in the idea of a meeting in Auckland itself and consisting of a large group of Friends. The trend in Auckland Friends was already drawing them to try again at organizing some kind of Meeting. However at this time enter Rufus P. King. Whilst he was in Auckland: "Friends were gathered together for a Meeting for Worship"[11] It would seem from this and other information that King played a considerable part in gathering the meeting together, however this would be a false assumption as I have argued. Help in almost every area of their activities is what was needed by Friends and in these visitors they found this. This is in no way to be construed as control. The visits of the Annetts in 1906-07 and the Corders in 1911 can be viewed in the same way. New Zealand Friends were moving towards independence and it was on their own initiative that many decisions of the period during which these couples visited

and in the decade 1911-20 came into being.

In the final analysis to move from a handful of individuals in 1840 to a well established church in 1920, represents a tremendous achievement for such a small group. In every period they were given impetus by outstanding individuals such as Thomas Mason, George Farrand and Rebecca Boot, Ann F. Jackson and her husband, Egerton Gill and all those who went to prison during the war years. However without a sense of group identity, which although only developed in the last twenty years of this period was implicit all through it, the Society would not have survived. The activities they took on could only have been done as a group. With the advent of the School the future of Friends which at one stage was deemed in peril was assured and by 1920 the Society enters a new era on a strong footing. The report of the 1915 General Meeting is an excellent illustration as to why Friends have survived.

> One Friend brought us face to face with the query as to what is our programme for extending our Society and the fact was borne home to us that when we can go, even as the early Friends did, boldly proclaiming our message, we shall find many who are hungering and thirsting round us for that which we have to hold out to them.[12]

ENDNOTES

1 Results of a census of the colony of New Zealand taken for the night of 3rd of March 1878

2 West M. and Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1841-1972 p.6

3 Ibid. p.7

4 Jackson F. The Past History of Friends in New Zealand File 33/8/3 MS Papers 2597 ATL p.30

5 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1904 MS Micro 647 ATL p.211

6 Auckland Two Months Meeting 22nd of July 1900 Min. 8

7 Report and Proceedings of Fourth Conference and 1st Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand ChCh. 1912 p.12

8 O'Conner P.S. The Awkward Ones: Dealing with Conscience 1916-18 New Zealand Journal of History Vol.8, No.2 (1974) p.125

9 Ibid. p.126

10 Havelock North Camp 1913 Proceedings and Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Friends in New Zealand p.6

11 Yearly Meeting Minutes 1886 ATL p.56

12 Wellington,1915:Extracts from the Minutes and Proceedings of the General Meeting of New Zealand Friends p.11

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I would like to thank my many friends and my family for helping me through this difficult time. Especially Ann and Steve for sharing the burden of thesis writing and to Jenny and Jimmy who have been my closest friends and supporters. To Jenny a special mention for her proofreading done with love. To the Staff of the Turnbull Library for their help especially to Kay Sanderson. Thanks to my supervisor and finally to Judy for stepping in at the last moment to do the last few bits.

Dedicated to my family but most especially to my Grandfather notknown but always loved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

ALEXANDER TURNBULL LIBRARY

MS MICRO 647

Continental Committee MS Minutes 1842-1868, 1868-1884, 1884-1891-1898, 1898-1905

Meeting for Sufferings MS Minutes Volumes 43-53

Australasian Committee MS Minutes Volumes 1-4

London Yearly Meeting Minutes 1863-1918

Alfred Wright Stones of Memorial Vols. 1 and 3

Issac Sharp, MS Diaries Vols. 33-39

Circular Letters of Herbert and Mary Grace Corders visit to Australia and New Zealand 1906-07

MS Box 2/4 E.B. Rutter: Account of Founding of Friends Hostel Wellington New Zealand

MS Box 5.2.3 Joesph Taylor: Ten Letters 25.3.1911-8.12.1911

MS Box 14/2 Epistles to and from Australia and New Zealand 1891-1897

MS Box 14/3 Epistles to and from Australia and New Zealand 1897-1900

MS Box 14/4 Epistles to and from Australia and New Zealand 1901-1907

MS Box 17/1 E.A. and E. M. Annett visit to New Zealand 1906-07

MS Box 17/2 Miscellaneous Australian Papers 1874-1935

MS Box 23/5 Papers relating to Conscription; Pamphlets and Handouts 1903-12

MS Box 23/8 Conscription in New Zealand and Australia News

Cuttings

MS Box 24/1 New Zealand Papers 1871-1904

MS Box 24/3 Printed Papers New Zealand 1870-1913

MANUSCRIPTS

MS Papers 54 Thomas Mason Papers

MS Papers 865 Frederick Mackie Journel 1853

MS Cot. 1842 Extracts of Diary of J.S. Cotterell

MS Stephens 1842-55 Extracts from Letters and Journel of Samuel Stephens 3 Volumes

MS Papers 2597

Series Twenty-Nine: New Zealand Friends Newsletter Committee

29/1 Young Friends Newsletters 1917

29/2 Young Friends Newsletters 1918

29/3 Young Friends Newsletters 1919

29/4 Young Friends Newsletters 1920

Series Thirty: Friends School, Wanganui

30/3/2 Pudney's history of the School'S Founding 1921

Series Thirty-Three: Archives

33/2 Nelson Quakers

33/2/1 History of Quakers in Nelson; general File

33/2/2 Letter, 25th June 1853, Robert Lindsay and Frederick Mackie, Wellington to Friends of Nelson Meeting
Letter, 5 April 1860, Samuel Strong, Nelson to Joesph B. Mather

33/2/3 Diary of Issac Mason Hill (No. 49) 1843-44

33/2/4 Typescript Histories of Nelson Quakers

33/3 Biographical Material

33/3/2 Alexander, W.H.F., Harriette

33/3/3 Beale, Joesph; Benson W.N.; Brailsford John

33/3/5 Fox, Ellen

33/3/7 Hodgkin Thomas

33/3/8 Littleboy, Wilfred

33/3/10 Pudney, R.W.E.

33/6 Pacifism

33/6/1a Conscientious Objection to Military Service (includes transcripts of appeals) 1909-1916

33/6/1b Conscientious Objection to Military Service (includes transcripts of appeals) 1909-1916

33/6/4 Peace Testimony 1912

33/6/5b Material removed from inside 33/6/5a (mainly correspondence of Ernest Wright) 1918

33/6/5c Material removed from inside 33/6/5a (letter to Ernest Wright and report on court martial of Egerton Gill) 1918

33/6/9 Appeal of Thomas Atkinson Bentley 1917

33/6/11 Sergant Detective Hollis v Gill (transcript of trial and judgement) 1915-16

33/6/12 Crown v Egerton Gill (transcript of trial and form of protest 1918

33/8 Material Relating to Histories of the Society of Friends

33/8/2 "A Quaker Chronicle" and notes

PRINTED SOURCES

Neave Joesph James, leaves from the Journel of ed. with notes by Joesph J. Green (London, Headley Bros., 1904)

Nelson Examiner Aug. 5, 1843

HOCKEN LIBRARY

Tuckett, Frederick Letters of Frederick Tuckett

Reports of the New Zealand Company Letter: March 23 1844
Documents relating to the Purchase of the Otago District for the site of the Scotch Settlement

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY LIBRARY ARCHIVES

Society of Friends General Meeting Reports and Selected Minutes 1911-1913, 1914-1921

Minute Book of Christchurch Preparative Meeting (Four Months Meeting 6 Feb 1913 - 3 April 1938

FRIENDS HOUSE LIBRARY LONDON

Letters of Katherine and William Jones MS Box 16/1

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

File ADI 227/9/1

AUCKLAND FRIENDS MEETING HOUSE

Minutes of Auckland Quarterly/Monthly Meeting 4 Books

No.1 8th 11th Month 1885 to 8th 11th Month 1903

No.2 10th 1st Month 1904 to 13th 10th Month 1912

No.3 10th 11th Month 1912 to 8th 10th Month 1916

No.4 12th 11th Month 1916 to 19th 12th Month 1920

SECONDARY SOURCES

Government Publications

The New Zealand Gazette 1892 Vol.2

The New Zealand Gazette 1916

Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representitives

1914 Vol.3

New Zealand Law Statutes 1892, 1909,1910,1912,1914,1915, 1916, 1918, 1919

New Zealand Parlimentary Debates 1912, 1916

Books

Allen R.M. Nelson: A History of Early Settlement (A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1965)

Borrows J.L Albertland The last organised British settlement in New Zealand (A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1969)

Broad L. The Jubilee History of Nelson 1842-1892 (Bond, Finney and Co. 1892)

Graham J. 'Settler Society' In Oliver W.W.& Williams B.R. (eds.) The Oxford History of New Zealand (Oxford University Press, 1981)

Hirst M.E. The Quakers in Peace and War. An Account of Their Peace Principles and Practices (Garland Publishing Inc., 1972)

Isichei E. Victorian Quakers (Oxford University Press, 1970)

Lloyd A. Quaker Social History 1669-1738 (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1950)

Lury S.J. Ann Fletcher Jackson: Pioneer Resident Minister in the Society of Friends, New Zealand (London, Headley Bros., 1904)

Quaker Spirituality. Selected Writings ed. by Douglas V. Steere (SPCK London, 1984)

Reed A.H. The Story of Otago. Age of Adventure (A.H. & A.W. Reed, 1947)

Religion in New Zealand 2nd. edition ed. by Nichol C. & Veitch J. (Victoria University Press, 1980)

Religion in New Zealand Society ed. by Colless B. & Donovan P. (Dunmore Press Ltd., 1980)

Ross I. Margaret Fell Mother of Quakerism (Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1949)

Simpson T. Te Riri Pakeha The White Mans Anger (Alister Taylor, 1979)

Thompson D.M. Non-Conformity in the Nineteenth Century

(Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1972)

Ward A. A Show of Justice. racial 'amalgamation' in the Nineteenth Century (Auckland University Press/ Oxford University Press, 1973)

West M. & Fawell R. The Story of New Zealand Quakerism 1842-1972 (New Zealand Yearly Meeting of Religious Society of Friends, 1973)

Articles

Isichei E. From Sect to Denomination in English Quakerism, With Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century The British Journal of Sociology Vol.15, (1964) pp. 207-221

O'Conner P.S. The Awkward Ones - Dealing with Conscience, 1916-1918 New Zealand Journal of History Vol.7, No.2, (1973) pp.118-133

Weitzel R.L. Pacifists and Anti-Militarists in New Zealand 1909-1914 New Zealand Journal of History Vol.8, No.2, (1974) pp. 118-133